LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.
DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Letter 81-2
No. 50
May 22 1861

COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
9155

THREE
SERMONS
Concerning the
Sacred Trinity.

By *JOHN WALLIS*, D. D.
Professor of Geometry, in the University of *Oxford*.

LONDON:
Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, in *Cheapside*, 1691.

THREE
SERMONS
Concerning the
Sacred Trinity.

By JOHN WILKINS, D.D.
Chaplain to his Majesty, late Master of Trinity College in Cambridge.

TO THE READER.

THE first of the three Sermons here following, is Printed according as it was Preached in Oxford, *in the Year* 1664. (*accommodated to that time and place;*) *but it was, for the Subſtance of it, Preached in* London *Twenty Years before that time. Which I mention to ſhew, that the Conſtruction which I give of the Words, is not a new forced Notion, juſt now taken up to ſerve a turn; or* (*as ſomebody is pleaſed to call it*) Equally New and Cautious: *But, what I did, ſo long ago, take to be a then received Truth. And, I ſince find, it is at leaſt as old as St.* Auſtin's Epiſt. 174. *The other Two are lately added, in purſuance of ſome other*

Diſcourſes lately made publick, concerning the Sacred Trinity. *Wherein much of what was ſaid before, ſcatteringly, (as thoſe who wrote againſt it gave occaſion;) is now inlarged and put into a little better Order. If what I have done may be ſerviceable to the Truth, and to the Church of God: I have what I did deſire, and ſhall not think the Labour ill beſtowed.*

A SERMON

Preached to the

UNIVERSITY of *Oxford.*

Decemb. 27. 1664.

JOH. XVIJ. 3.

Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, καὶ, ὃν ἀπέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the onely true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

I Need not apologize for the seasonableness of this Text; by telling you, that the Subject-Matter of it, suites well with the great Solemnity, which at this time we celebrate;

and the Pen-man, with that of the day: Because a Discourse on such a Subject, can never be unseasonable to a Christian Auditory. Especially to such as, whose profession being to seek after Knowledge, should not decline that of God and Christ, the chief of all.

Nor will it be any Exception hereunto:

That it is no news, but well known already: Not only because That there be many who pretend to know what they do not, or do in effect deny; and That there be many things, which, though we know well, we have need enough to be minded of: But even because I do not find that many persons are wont to be displeased with being often minded of those things wherein they think that either their Interest or Excellency lies; more than a good Wit when commended, or a fair Lady with being told she is handsome; even though sometimes (as we are wont to say) they know it but too well already. And therefore, since to know God and Christ is both our Interest and our Commendation; it will not, I hope, seem grievous to any to hear it discoursed of; to the end that those who know it not may be incited to learn it, and those who know it, may take content in it.

And

And I shall as little apologize for a plain Discourse on this Subject: Since it is both my Profession and Practice, to Demonstrate or make things as plain as I can; not to perplex or make them intricate; which may amuse the Auditors, or sometimes please or tickle them; but is not wont either to Teach, or Perswade: like too much of Ornament, which doth but disguise the native Beauty; or too much Trimming, which hides the Cloth.

The words read, are our Saviour's Words; addressed to his Father in the behalf of his Disciples: And are a part of that Prayer with which he closeth his large Exhortation, or Farewel-Sermon to his Disciples, the night before he was to suffer; of which we have a large rehearsal in the three foregoing Chapters, the *14th*, *15th*, and *16th*: which this *17th*. closeth with a Prayer.

He begins his Prayer, with a Petition concerning *Eternal Life*, which he was to bestow (according to the Power his Father had granted him) to as many as He had given him; that is, to as many as should effectually believe in him. To which Petition he subjoins this Exegetical *Epiphonema*, *And this is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*

We may consider the words either according to a *Synthetic* or an *Analytic* method, as the Schools speak: The former of which they commonly follow in Sciences *Theoretical*; the latter in *Practical*.

If considered *Synthetically*; they present us with, *First*, The *Cause*, or Principle; *The Knowledge of God and Christ*: and, *Secondly*, The *Effect*, or Consequent resulting from it; *Eternal Life*.

If *Analytically*; we have in them, *First*, A glorious *End* proposed; *Eternal Life*: and, *Secondly*, The *Means* proportionate thereunto; *The Knowledge of God and Christ*.

In the former way, the Result of them is to this purpose; *That the excellent Knowledge of God and Christ, is attended with this most glorious Consequent, Eternal Life.*

In the latter way, it amounts to thus much: *That the way or means to Eternal Life, is the Knowledge of God and Christ.*

Nor is it much material, whether of the two ways we take them; *Synthetically*, or *Analytically*: whether we take them as a *Theorem*; affirming this Effect, of that Cause: or as a *Problem*; directing to these Means for such an End.

Yet

Yet I chuſe rather to take them in the latter conſideration, (though not excluſive of the former;) Becauſe, this *Epiphonema* taking its riſe from the mention made of *Eternal Life*, in the former verſe; (not from a former mention of the *Knowledge of God and Chriſt*;) it ſeems to be rather intended as a *Direction* how to *attain Eternal Life*; than, an account of the *Effect* of ſuch a *Knowledge*. But, in doing the one, it doth the other alſo.

I ſhall begin, *firſt*, with that which lies firſt in the order of the word; The *End* propoſed; or the *Effect*, or Conſequent of this Knowledge; the *Happineſs* which doth attend it: which, for its Excellency, is called *Life*, and, for its Duration, *Eternal*. *This is life eternal.*

The word *Life* I take to be here uſed in a figurative ſenſe; and to import *Good* or *Happineſs*: like as, its contrary, *Death*, eſpecially *Death Eternal*, to import *Miſery*.

There is indeed, at leaſt, a threefold *Life* commonly mentioned; and, in proportion thereunto, a threefold *Death*: Natural, Spiritual, and Eternal.

Life *Natural*, (which is indeed the proper acceptation of the word *Life*, or the firſt ſignification of it,) is more eaſily apprehended, than

than expreſſed. It imporrs that active ſtate or condition which ariſeth from the *Union of the Soul and Body*, as well in *Man*, as in other *Animals*; (not to mention that of Plants:) the deſtruction or want of which, upon the Soul's departure, we call *Death*. 'Tis that, according to which, in common ſpeech, a Man or Beaſt is ſaid to be alive or dead.

Now this *Life*, is, of all *natural Goods*, looked upon as the chiefeſt; and conſequently *Death* the greateſt of *natural Evils*: Becauſe Life is that foundation or firſt good, which makes us capable of what elſe is ſo: and with our Life, we loſe all the reſt. Hence that in *Job* 2.4. *Skin for skin, and all that a man hath, will he give for his life.* And that of *Solomon*; *A living Dog is better than a dead Lion*, Eccleſ. 9.4. For, when Life is gone, there ſucceeds an incapacity, not only of Doing, but alſo of Enjoying Good.

From this conſideration it is, that the other ſignifications of the word have their Original. For Life being looked upon as the greateſt natural Good, and Death as the greateſt natural Evil; The one (by a *Synechdoche ſpeciei*) is frequently uſed (both in ſacred and profane Authours) to ſignify *Good* indefinitely, eſpecially the

the *greatest Good*; and the other, in like manner, to signifie *Evil*, especially the *greatest Evil*. The one is put for *Happiness*, and the other for *Misery*.

And then, again, (by a *Synechdoche generis*) this general notion of Good or Evil, Happiness or Misery, implied in the words Life and Death, becomes applicable to this or that particular Good and Evil, as occasion serves. Suppose the Spiritual Life of *Grace*, or *Death* in *Sin*: And the Eternal Life of *Glory* in Heaven, or the Eternal Death of *Torment* in Hell. Thus, *Deut.* 30. 19. *I have set before you* (saith *Moses* to *Israel*) *life and death, blessing and cursing*: (where Life and Death, are made equivalent to Blessing and Cursing;) *therefore chuse life* (saith he) *that thou and thy seed may Live*; that is, that you may be Happy. So at *ver.* 15. of the same Chapter; *I have set before you* (saith he) *life and good, death and evil.* Where Life and Good are put exegetical each of other, and so Death and Evil. And in the same sense it is the Poet tells us, *Non est Vivere, sed Valere, vita.* Thus God to *Adam* in Paradise (for 'tis no new Trope, nor of yesterday) *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death*; that is, thou shalt become miserable: For we know that *Adam* did not the same day

die

die a natural Death; but ſome hundreds of years after: but he did that day begin to be in a ſtate of Miſery, whereof his natural Death was but a part. So, *Rom.* 6. 23. *The wages of ſin is death*; where the comprehenſion of all the Evils or Miſery which ſin deſerves, or God inflicteth for it, is called *Death*: like as on the contrary, all the Happineſs, which the Saints enjoy, is, on the ſame account, called *Life*; *The gift of God is eternal Life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* So here: By *Life* we underſtand *Happineſs*; contrary to which is the *Death* of *Miſery*: and then (by a *Metalepſis*, or double Trope,) that *Happineſs* in ſpecial, which the Saints enjoy in *Glory* (though not excluſive of what they have before;) and that *Miſery* which in *Hell* attends the wicked.

'Tis true indeed, that the condition of the Saints in Glory, after the Reſurrection, may, even in a proper ſenſe, be called Life; becauſe of that Union, which ſhall then be, of Soul and Body; and the exerciſe of (at leaſt the moſt noble) faculties of Life. Yet do not I take that to be the true import of the Word here. For though it be true, that the Saints in Glory, have not only an *Union of Soul and Body*, but likewiſe a *knowledge* or *ſenſe* of that eſtate wherein

wherein they are, (which may import not only a Life, but even a Rational Life:) yet as true it is, that the Damned in Hell have so too; (for their Souls and Bodies shall not be less *United*; nor shall they be *Insensible* of their Woful condition:) yet is not that estate of theirs called a *Life* (though naturally it be so, and it is their misery that it is so,) but *Eternal Death*; because a Life of Wo and Misery; not of Bliss and Happiness: A *Living Misery*, being, in this sense, the truest *Death*.

Secondly, As it is called *Life* for its Excellency, so, for its Duration, it is called *Eternal*.

It is very usual in Scripture, in the use of Allegories, or Figurative expressions, to add some kind of *Epithet* to distinguish the word so used from the same in its native signification: And, when the word is used so as to express figuratively somewhat *more excellent* than it self, the *Epithet* hath somewhat of additional *excellency* in it. Thus Christ is said to be the *Spiritual rock*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. the *Living Bread*, *or Manna that came down from Heaven*, Joh. 6. 50. to distinguish the words, so metaphorically used, from the Rock and Manna literally spoken of, in the story of their travails in the Wilderness. And the Church of Christ, as *Living stones*, be-

come a *Spiritual houſe*, and a *Holy prieſthood*, to offer up *Spiritual ſacrifices* to God, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. Where the Epithets ſerve both for diſtinction from the material Stones and Temple, the Levitical Prieſthood, and corporeal Sacrifices; and for the commendation or preheminence of thoſe before theſe. So the *new heaven*, and the *new earth*, and the *new Jeruſalem*, Rev. 21. 1, 2. *Jeruſalem that is above*, Gal. 4. 26. And Matth. 26. 29. *I will drink no more* (ſaith Chriſt) *of the fruit of the vine, till I drink it New with you in my Father's kingdom*: Not that Chriſt did intend anew to drink of ſuch wine in his Father's Kingdom; but of a *New wine*, another ſort of wine than that commonly ſo called; to wit, thoſe ſpiritual Joys in his Father's Kingdom, which ſhould more refreſh their Hearts and Souls, than this wine did their Bodies. So; *I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman*, Joh. 15. 1. *I am the good ſhepherd*, Joh. 10. 11. Not that Chriſt was more truly a *Vine*, in propriety of ſpeech, than that which we ſo call; or indeed a *Shepherd*, who took the care of Sheep: But that there was in Chriſt ſomewhat of another kind much more eminent, than that of the *Vine*, which did yet in ſome meaſure reſemble it; and, a much greater

ter Care, but of another nature, of those he calls his Flock, than a *Shepherd* hath of his Sheep. So here; *This is life eternal:* Not a natural Life, (such as is commonly meant by the word *Life*,) a life of the Body, which after a short time is to be exchanged for Death; but a Life, a Happiness, of another nature; a far more excellent Good than what we call Life, which doth but very imperfectly express it; An *Eternal Life.*

And this *Eternity*, as it serves, in general, to distinguish this word *Life* from the ordinary acceptation; and doth import, for the kind of it, somewhat much more excellent: So it doth particularly point out that *Everlasting Duration* of this so great a Happiness. 'Tis that which, though indeed it have a Beginning, shall never have an End. And upon this account it is, that it is so often called *Eternal Life*, and *Life Everlasting*; that it were endless to enumerate the places where it is so called.

An eternal inheritance; *A house eternal in the heavens*; *An inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, which fadeth not away*; *A kingdom which cannot be moved*; *An eternal weight of glory*; *When our mortal shall have put on immortality.* Heb. 9.15. 2 Cor. 5.1. 1 Pet. 1.4. Heb. 12.28. 2 Cor. 4.17. 1 Cor. 15. 53.

And this consideration of *Eternity*, added to that of *Life*; this everlasting Duration, to that unspeakable, unimaginable Happiness; renders this *Eternal Life*, a perfect Felicity and every way compleat. For that Perfection of *Degree*, imported in the word *Life*, can admit of no addition, but that of Perfect *Continuance*, which the word *Eternal* assures us of. Like as, on the other hand, that perfection of *Misery*, which attends the wicked, is capable of no greater Aggravation, than that of *Perpetuity*: sealed up in that sad expression of a Living Misery, *Eternal Death*. You have them both paralleled in *Matth.* 25. 46. *These shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.*

I have now done with the first part, the Happiness here proposed; *Eternal Life*.

Before I come to the second, *The knowledge of God and Christ*; it will be requisite to consider, a little, the connexion of these together, in the word *Is*; *This* is *Life Eternal*. Which is capable of a double acceptation. For it may be understood either as a *Formal*, or as a *Causal* predication. *This is life eternal*; that is, *Herein consisteth* eternal life. Or else thus; *This is life eternal*,

eternal, that is, *This is is the Way* or *means*, *to attain* eternal Life.

The former of these is very agreeable to the doctrine of the Schoolmen; who generally place the Happiness of Heaven in the *Beatifick Vision*; in the seeing or knowing of God. Grounded on such places as that of *Matth.* 5. 8. *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* 1 Cor. 13. 9, 10, 12. *We know but in part, and we prophesie but in part; but when that which is perfect shall come, then that which is in part shall be done away: We now see through a glass darkely, but then face to face: Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.* 2 Cor. 3. 18. *We all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory.* 1 Joh. 3. 2. *Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know, that when he shall appear, (or, when it shall appear) we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is.* With others of the like import. And certainly that Perfection of Knowledge, shall be at least a great part of that Happiness, which we expect in Heaven; as from these and other the like places is well collected. So that it is not improperly said, that *Eternal Life* doth, at least in part, *consist* in such a knowledge. Nor

Nor is it any ſufficient Objection hereunto, to ſay, That, it is not by knowledge only, as an Act of the Underſtanding, that we enjoy God, wherein our Happineſs conſiſts; but by an Act of the Will alſo, chuſing and cloſing with, and delighting in him.

For though this be true; yet neither is the Knowledge here ſpoken of, a bare *Speculative*, or Notional Knowledge, wherein the Underſtanding is alone concerned: But an *Active*, Operative Knowledge; ſuch as brings the Will, Affections, and all the Faculties into a proportionate Conformity thereunto. And in ſuch a Knowledge of God in the Underſtanding, attended with ſuch a Conformity in the Will and other Faculties, it is not to be denyed that our Happineſs doth conſiſt; even that of Eternal Life.

Yet (without excluding this ſenſe) I take the words here to be rather a *Cauſal* Predication: aſſigning the way or Means whereby Eternal Life is attained. *This is life eternal*, that is, this is the Way to attain Eternal Life; *To know thee the only true God*, &c. The knowledge of God and Chriſt, being the direct way to attain Eternal Life. Parallel to which, is that of our Saviour, *Joh.* 12. 50. *His commandment is life everlaſting.*

everlaſting. And very frequent elſewhere are ſuch *Metonymies* of the *Effect* for the Cauſe. *I am the reſurrection, and the life,* ſaith Chriſt, *Joh.* 11. 25. that is, The Authour of it. So *Luk.* 12. 15. *Man's life conſiſteth not in the abundance of the things which he poſſeſſeth*; that is, it doth not depend upon it; it is not ſecured by it: or as Chriſt elſewhere, *Matth.* 4. 4. (out of *Deut.* 8. 3.) *Man liveth not by bread alone*, &c. And *Moſes*, ſpeaking of their diligent obſerving the Commands of God, *Deut.* 32. 47. *This is your life,* (ſaith he) *and through this thing you ſhall prolong your days*: (where the latter Clauſe is enegetical of the former:) juſt in the ſame form with the words here, *This is life eternal*; that is, hereby they ſhall attain eternal Life.

This therefore being the moſt plain and ſimple Interpretation of the Words: We are now to enquire particularly, what that is that Chriſt here ſays to be Eternal Life, or rather the Way thereunto. *That they may know thee the only true God*; *and, whom thou haſt ſent, Jeſus Chriſt.*

Which contains in brief the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, or *Chriſtian Religion*: Diſtinguiſhed into two parts, *The Knowledge of God*, and *The Knowledge*

Knowledge of Jesus Christ. Both which are necessary to bring us to Eternal Life.

I shall speak, *first*, to the former of these two; the Knowledge of God; that is, of *God the Creatour* and *Lord of all*; as contradistinguished to that of *Christ* the *Redeemer*. Ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, *That they might know thee the only true God.*

By *Thee*, or the Person here spoken to, we are to understand *God*, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; (For to him it is manifest, that Christ doth here direct his Prayer:) Yet not so much in his *Personal* as in his *Essential* consideration. For it is not the *Personality*, but the *Essence* of the Father, that determines him to be *the only true God.*

We have therefore, in the Object of this Knowledge, at least, these Three Propositions:

I. That there is a God. II. That there is but One (True) God. III. That God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is this God.

I. The First of these strikes at *Atheism*, or those that deny a God. And that we know thus much is necessary from that of *Heb.* xi. 6. *He that cometh unto God, must believe that God is,*

is, and that he is a rewarder of thoſe that diligently ſeek him. Πιστεῦσαι δεῖ ὅτι ἔστι. He muſt believe, *That there is a God.* Nay, he muſt believe alſo ſomewhat of *What he is*: Not fanſie to himſelf ſomewhat under the name of God, which indeed is not a God; or notions inconſiſtent with that of a Deity; as thoſe, *Pſal.* 50. 21. *Thou thoughteſt that I was altogether ſuch a one as thy ſelf*: or the like. For to believe ſuch a falſe notion of God, is not to believe a God, but to believe an Idol.

We are next to know, as that there is a God; ſo, That there is but One God. I mean; But One True God. For *there are indeed*, as the Apoſtle tells us, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 5, 6. *Gods many, and Lords many*; that is, there are *that are called Gods*, (for ſo he explains himſelf) *but to us there is but One God; We know*, (ſaith he) *that there is no other God but One.* And this indeed depends upon the former. For he that doth, according to a true notion of God, know That there is a God; muſt needs know alſo that there is *but One.* For the true notion of God, including Infinite, Abſolute, Perfect, &c. muſt needs alſo include Unity; for it is inconſiſtent that there ſhould be many ſuch. So that, in a manner, Polytheiſm includes A-

theiſm. He that believes many Gods, doth, in effect, not believe any: that is, not any ſuch Being as of which it is impoſſible there ſhould be more than One.

We are, *Thirdly*, to know, that *This* God, is that onely True God. I ſay, This God; whom we have variouſly deſigned in Scripture, by ſeveral Characters. *The God that made Heaven and Earth*: *The living God*: *The God of Iſrael*: *The God whoſe name is Jehovah*: And (as here, and elſewhere frequently in the New Teſtament) *the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. By which and other the like Characters, he is diſtinguiſhed from all falſe Gods, from all pretended Deities. This God we are to know to be the onely True God.

But, when I ſay, That the *Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* is this *onely True God*; I add, That this appertains not ſo much to his *Perſonality* as to his *Eſſence*. For though the three Perſons in the Sacred Trinity, be diſtinguiſhed each from other by their *Perſonalities*, (the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, *&c.*) yet they all communicate in the common *Eſſence*; whereby the Son as well as the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt as either, is this *Onely True God*. The Perſon of the *Father* is indeed *True*

God,

God, but not according to his Perſonality, but according to his Eſſence. And the Perſon of the *Son* is God alſo, and the True God; yet not another, but *the ſame* True God. And the *Holy Ghoſt* likewiſe. According to that of *Joh.* 10. 30. *I and my Father are One*: That is, *One mod*, though not *One Perſon*. And 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. *There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe Three are One.* Three, and yet One. Three Perſons, yet but One God. They are all this One, this Onely True God; beſide whom there is no God.

I know there are ſome who would be glad to take advantage of this place, to the Derogation of the Divinity of Chriſt, and of the Holy Ghoſt. As if it were here affirmed, That *the Father onely* were *True God*: and therefore, not the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt.

But the Cavil is obvious, and the Anſwer eaſie. It is not ſaid that the *Father Onely* is True God; but that the Father is *the onely True God*; he is that God beſide whom there is no other True God: which may well enough be ſaid, though the Son alſo (as indeed he is) be *that ſame True God*; and the Holy Ghoſt likewiſe. Indeed ſhould we ſay, That the

Son were alſo *True God*, and *another* God; the Father could not then be ſaid to be the *Onely* True God, ſince that there would be another True God beſide this. (And the like of the Holy Ghoſt.) But to ſay that the Son is *the Same* True God, is well conſiſtent with it. For though another Perſon than the Father be True God, yet, becauſe not Another God, this One God remains ſtill the Onely True God. And the original words are to this purpoſe very clear; Ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. Where the Article τὸν coming before μόνον, (not after it) doth determine it to be a reſtriction of the Prædicate, not of the Subject. 'Tis not σὲ μόνον, τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, but σὲ, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. Not *Thee onely* to be *the True God*; but (as we truly render it) *Thee* to be *the onely True God.* That is; To know Thee to be that God, beſide which God there is no other True God; though another beſide Thee be likewiſe this onely True God; *viz.* the ſame God with Thee, though not the ſame Perſon. It excludes only a Plurality of Gods, not a Plurality of Perſons in the ſame God-head. 'Tis true indeed, That this Divinity, is not, in this place, ſo directly Affirmed, either of the Son, or the Holy Ghoſt: But, neither is it Denyed:

And

And therefore it is to receive its deciſion from other places where it is affirmed clearly.

And thus much concerning the firſt branch of this Knowledge, the Knowledge of God. *To know Thee, the only True God.*

There is another piece of Knowledge neceſſary to the attainment of Eternal Life; the Knowledge of Chriſt. For ſo it follows, *And Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.*

'Tis true, that had we continued in that Eſtate wherein Man was at firſt Created, there had been no neceſſity of this ſecond branch of Knowledge. For, had there been no Sin, there had been no need of a Saviour: and conſequently, not of this knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt. A knowledge of God, the onely True God, with an Obedience conformable thereunto, had then been enough to make us Happy. But Man, by his Fall, having contracted an Eſtate of Miſery; there is now no Reſtitution to our loſt Happineſs, but by a Redemption; and there is no Redemption, but by Jeſus Chriſt. For as *there is but One God*; ſo, *but One Mediator between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *Neither is there any other name given to men, whereby we muſt be ſaved, but that of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth*; *whom*

they

they Crucified, and God raiſed from the dead : (Act. 4. 10, 12.) *There is no Salvation in any other.* It is neceſſary therefore, to the attainment of Eternal Life, that we know Him, in this Capacity.

What we are to know concerning him, though we cannot expect, in ſo few words, toh ave clearly ſet down, without a Comment from other places to give light to them : Yet at leaſt three things ſeem in theſe words to be pointed at ; His Divinity, His Incarnation, and His Mediatory Office.

1. His *Divinity* ; in that he is the *Son of God.* For he calls him *Father*, whom he ſays we muſt know to be the *onely True God.* Indeed, were he onely the Son of God in ſuch a ſenſe as *Adam* is ſo called, *Luke* 3. 38. or the *Angels* thought to be, *Job* 1. 6. that is, by *Creation* ; for as *Saints* are ſo called (*Rom.* 8. and elſewhere,) that is, by *Adoption* ; it would not inner a Divinity. But to be (as Chriſt is) the *Son* of God by *Eternal Generation*, argues a Communication in the *ſame Nature.* As the Apoſtle infers, Heb. 1. 5. *For to which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee ?* This *onely begotten of the Father*, muſt needs be alſo of the *ſame nature* with the Father ;

Father; and therefore, God, as he is.

And this Argument, (however now perhaps there are who endeavour to elude it) the Jews, his Enemies, thought to be concluſive. For when they obſerved him to call *God his Father*, or pretend himſelf to be *the Son of God*; eſpecially, *the Chriſt the Son of God*; they did not underſtand him to ſpeak in ſuch a ſenſe as when themſelves were commonly wont ſo to ſpeak (as Joh. 8. 41. *We are not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God*;) but in ſuch a ſenſe as they judged Blaſphemous, (and had been ſo indeed, had it not been true;) who *therefore ſought the more to kill him*, (Joh. 5. 18.) *becauſe he ſaid, That God was his Father; making himſelf Equal with God.* And the *High Prieſt* (Matth. 26. 65.) *rent his Cloths, ſaying, He ſpeaketh Blaſphemy*, when our Saviour affirmed before him, That *he was the Chriſt, the Son of God.* 'Twas manifeſt therefore, that he ſo ſpake, and they ſo underſtood him, of ſuch a *Son-ſhip* as argued a *Divinity*, a being *equal with God.*

2. His *Humanity*, or Incarnation, is pointed at, in theſe words, *whom thou haſt ſent.* For by the Fathers *ſending him*, or his *coming into the World*, is clearly meant his being *Incarnate*, or *made*

made Man. As Gal. 4. 4. *God sent his Son made of a Woman.* And Joh. 1. 14. *The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt amongst us.*

3. His *Mediatory Office*, is implyed as well in the Title *Christ*, added to his Name *Jesus*; as in that of his being *sent by God. Jesus the Christ*, or *Jesus the Messiah*, *whom thou hast sent.* For as his Name *Jesus* doth design the Person; so the Title *Christ*, that is *Messiah*, (that in Greek, answering to this in Hebrew, and both signifying the *Anointed*) doth import the Office, to which he was designed, and for which he was sent. For God did not send him, to no purpose; but sent him for this end, for this Work, *To be the Mediator between God and Man*; *To reconcile us to the Father*; *To make an Atonement or Propitiation for us. To take away the sins of the World*; *To obtain Eternal Redemption*; *To procure an Everlasting Inheritance*; *a purchased Possession*; *To make Intercession for us*; *To save to the uttermost those that come unto God by him.* Or, as *Joh.* 3. 16, 17. (where all the three Particulars are likewise intimated) *God therefore sent his onely begotten Son into the World, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life.*

1 Tim. 2. 5. Col. 1. 20, 21. Rom. 5. 10, 11. & *alibi.* 1 Joh. 2. 2. Joh. 1. 29. Heb. 9. 12, 15. Eph. 1. 14. Heb. 7. 25.

And

And now, having gone through the whole Text, we might, if time would ſuffer, look back upon it to take a new Survey thereof, and collect from thence ſome of thoſe particular deductions which might concern our practice. For certainly, the Knowledge which Chriſt here declares *neceſſary* to *Eternal Life*, and the *means* conducing thereunto, is not a bare *Notional knowledge*, or a pure *ſpeculative Belief*, (ſuch as *the Devils* may have as well as we;) Jam. 2 19. but an *operative Knowledge*, a *practical Faith*, a Faith *fruitful in good Works*; without which thoſe ſpeculative notions will never bring us to Heaven. And therefore, without ingaging in the nice Diſputes, of Juſtification by Faith alone, or Works concurring thereunto; this is on all hands agreed without diſpute, That *Faith without good Works* will never juſtify us. Whatever their influence be, in Juſtification; their Preſence at leaſt is neceſſary. Without *Doing*, we cannot, in God's account, be reputed either to *Believe* or *Know*. Thoſe that *obey him not*, are reckoned, in God's account, amongſt thoſe that *Know not God*: at leaſt amongſt thoſe *who profeſs they know God, but do in their works deny him*. Who ſhall be ſo far, by ſuch a Knowledge, from obtaining *Eter-*

2 Theſ. 1. 8. Tit. 1. 16.

nal Life, that *Christ shall come in flaming fire to take vengeance on them, and to punish them with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his Power.*

In particular: *If we know God, to be the onely True God*; Then must we *Love* him, *Fear* him, *Worship* him, and *Obey* him. Nor doth the knowledge of Christ, as *Mediator*, abate any thing of this *Duty*. For though he came to
Gal. 3. 13. *take away the Curse of the Law, by being made a Curse for us*; yet not our *Obligation* thereunto.
Matth. 5. 17. *He came not to destroy the Law*, or make it less obligatory to duty, *but to fulfill it*. I may add; That, those, who will not *acknowledge* themselves under the *Obligation* of it, have reason to fear, they be yet under the *Curse* of it.

Again, *If we know Christ whom he hath sent*; It will be our duty then to *Believe in him*; (For
Joh. 17. 2. 'tis, *to those onely*, that *Christ doth give eternal life*.) And, so to *Believe* in him, as to *Obey*
2 Thes. 1. 8. him; For, *to those who obey not the Gospel of his Son*, it is, that *Christ shall render vengeance in flaming fire.*

Furthermore: If in this Christ we hope to have *Eternal Life*; how should this excite our *Rejoicing* and *Thankfulness* for so *great Salvation!* Not by Rioting and Drunkenness; by Revelling

velling, and Debauchery; (which is the Abuſe, not the Celebration, of this Solemnity, in memory of Chriſt's Incarnation;) But by a *pious* Remembrance and Commemoration of that Redemption obtained for us: ſuch as may be to the *Honour*, not the Reproach, of him that came to *Redeem us from our vain Converſation*: *That, denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, we ſhould live Godly, Righteouſly, and Soberly in this preſent World*: *Looking for that bleſſed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; who gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himſelf, a peculiar People, zealous of good Works.* 1 Pet. 1. 18. Tit. 2. 12, 13, 14.

To whom with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, be Glory for evermore.

The End of the Firſt Sermon.

A Second

SERMON

Concerning the

TRINITY:

TO THE

UNIVERSITY of *Oxford.*

April 26. 1691.

JOH. XVII. 3.

Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, καὶ, ὃν ἀπέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the onely true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

IT is now a great many years since, in this Place (if not to this Auditory) I did discourse of these Words. I shall repeat very little of that Discourse: But think fit to add somewhat to what was then said. Our

Our Saviour, in the three Chapters next foregoing (the 14*th*, 15*th*, and 16*th*. Chapters of S. *John*'s Gospel) had made a large Discourse to his Disciples (after his Institution of the Lord's Supper) the night before he was to Die; which (in this 17*th*. Chapter) he closeth with a Prayer, to his Father, in their behalf.

Wherein having made mention of *Eternal Life* (ver. 2.) which he was to *give*, to as many as the Father had *given him*, (that is, to as many as should effectually Believe in him;) he subjoins this *Epiphonema*, *And This is Life Eternal, That they might know Thee, the only True God; and, whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.*

In which words, we have Two things proposed to us: The Christian's *Happiness*; And, The *Means* whereby it is to be attained.

I. The *Christian's Happiness*, is called *Life*, as to its *Excellency*: and *Eternal*, as to its *Duration*. Which is *Begun* here, in the Kingdom of *Grace*: and is to be *Perfected*, and for ever *Continued*, in that of *Glory*.

II. The *Means* to attain it, is the *Knowledge* of *God* and *Christ*.

Where, by *Knowledge*, I do not understand a meer *Notional* or *Speculative* Knowledge; (For

(For ſuch I preſume the Devils may have in as large a proportion as any of us, and yet never attain *Eternal Life*:) But an *Active, Practical* Knowledge: Such a Knowledge as is attended with *Faith* and with *Practice* ſuitable thereunto. As in that of *Iſa.* 53. 11. *By his Knowledge*, (that is, by the Knowledge of Him) *ſhall my righteous Servant juſtifie many*: That is, by *Faith* in him, attended with a ſuitable *Practice* to it.

The *Object* of this Knowledge is declared to be twofold. 1. The Knowledge of *God*; and 2. The Knowledge of *Chriſt*. *To know Thee the onely True God*; that's one part. *And* (*whom thou haſt ſent*) *Jeſus Chriſt*; that's the other.

And each of theſe contains ſeveral Particulars.

The former of them contains at leaſt theſe Three. 1. That there is a *God*. 2. That there is *but One* (True) *God*. 3. That the *Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, is this *Onely True God*. He is *that God*, beſides *which God*, there is *no other* True God. And, though *Jeſus Chriſt* be *God* alſo; yet not *another* God, but *the ſame* True God. For *He and the Father are One*. Joh. 10. 30.

In the latter of them (the Knowledge of Chriſt) are Three things alſo. 1. His *Divi-*

nity.

nity. 2. His *Humanity.* And 3. His *Mediatory Office.* Which are here briefly insinuated; and are elsewhere more fully expressed.

1. His *Divinity*, in that he is the *Son* of the *Father*, who is the *Onely True God*: Not by *Creation*, as *Adam* and the *Angels* are called the Sons of God: nor by *Adoption*, as are the *Righteous*, who truly believe in Christ: But by *Generation*, as the *Onely Begotten of the Father*, (*Joh.* 1. 14.) and therefore of the *same Nature* with the Father.

2. His *Humanity*; implyed in these words, *Whom Thou hast sent.* That is, *So* sent as to be *made of a Woman*: so sent as to be *made Flesh.* Gal. 4. 4. Joh. 1. 14.

3. His *Mediatory Office*: implyed in the Title *Christ*, added to the Name *Jesus*, (*And, whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.*) He was *so sent*, as to be *the Christ*, the *Messias.* So sent, as that *the World through him might be Saved*: So, as that *whosoever Believes in him should not Perish, but have Everlasting Life.* Joh. 3. 16, 17.

Of all which Points I did then Discourse more largely; and therefore do now but name them.

But I did then further observe, from the *Order* of the Words, (to obviate a Cavil of the

the *Socinians*,) that the Word *Onely* (μόνον) is here Reſtrictive, not of (the *Subject*) *Thee*; but of (the *Predicate*) the *True God*. Of which I intend (with God's Aſſiſtance, and your Patience) to ſpeak further at this time.

Objection I.

The firſt and great *Objection* of the *Socinians*, from this place, againſt the *Divinity of Chriſt*, and the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, is this; If the *Father* be the *onely true God*; then the *Son*, or *Holy-Ghoſt*, is *not God*, or *not the True God*; but *the Father onely*.

To which I ſhall give Three things in Anſwer.

1. This Argument is a plain *Fallacy*; which they put upon us, by a willful perverting the Order of the Words. For it is not ſaid *Thee Onely* to be the *True God*, (as if not the *Son* alſo, or the *Holy-Ghoſt*, were the *True God*, but *the Father onely*:) But, *to Know Thee* (not *Thee onely*, or *Onely Thee*,) to be the *Onely true God*. Nor is it ſo in our *Engliſh* Tranſlation onely; but in the Original *Greek*: ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν. It is not σε μόνον, τὸν, but σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν. Where the Article τὸν coming after σε, and before μόνον, doth deter-

mine the Reſtrictive μόνον, not to be applied to the *Subject* σὲ, but to the *Predicate*, ἀληθινὸν θεόν. Juſt as, in our Engliſh, the Article *The*, coming between *Thee* and *Onely*, doth confine the word *Onely*, not to *Thee* (that went before,) but to *True God*, which follows. *To know Thee* (not *onely Thee*,) *the onely true God.* That is, to know *Thee* to be *that God*, beſide *which God*, there is *no other* true God. Which we readily Acknowledge, and Profeſs.

And then the *Socinians* Argument will appear juſt in this Form: The *God of Abraham* is the *Onely true God*; And therefore not the *God of Iſaac*, nor the *God of Jacob.* Yes, ſay I; the God of *Iſaac* is *the ſame* God with the God of *Abraham*; And therefore *the True God* as he is. And the God of *Jacob*, likewiſe.

And this one Anſwer doth fully ſatisfy the Objection, and there needs no more. Yet I ſhall add Two other things (though they might here be ſpared) becauſe they may be of uſe elſewhere.

2. I ſay further: If it had been ſaid (as it is not) *Thee Onely*; yet even this would not exclude any who is *the ſame with Him.* And therefore, not the *Son*, nor the *Holy-Ghoſt*; ſince they are *One and the ſame God with Him.* (*I*

and

and the Father are One, Joh. 10. 30. *Theſe Three are One*, 1 Joh. 5. 7.)

To which purpoſe, conſider we what we have *Jer.* 16. 14, 15. and again *Jer.* 23. 7, 8. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that it ſhall no more be ſaid, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Iſrael out of the land of Egypt; But, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Iſrael from the land of the North*, or *out of the North Country*. Now we are told by God himſelf, *Exod.* 20. 2, 3. *I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, --- Thou ſhalt have no other God but ME.* Shall we therefore argue thus; The God who *brought Iſrael out of Egypt*, is the *onely true God*; and we muſt *have no other God but HIM.* Therefore, not him *who brought Iſrael out of the North-Country?* Yes, ſay I, *Him* alſo. For the God *who brought them out of the North-Country*, is the *ſame God*, with him *who brought them out of Egypt*, (not *another God*, though deſigned by *another Character*,) and therefore, in having *Him*, we have not *another* God. So here; *To Know thee onely* (if it had been ſo ſaid, as it is not;) it had implied no more but thus, *Not any who is not the ſame God with Thee.* To Know *Thee Onely* (and not any other, who is not the ſame God with

Thee) to be *the true God.* Which therefore would not exclude the *Son* nor *Holy Ghoſt*, who are the *ſame God* with the *Father.* But of this Anſwer, there is no need in this place, becauſe it is not ſaid *Thee Onely*, or *onely Thee.*

3. I ſay further; If it had been ſaid (as it is not) *Thee Onely*, (as the *Socinians* would have it to be underſtood;) I would then ſay, This were an *Eſſential* Predication, rather than a *Perſonal.* That is, That the Predicate *True God*, is affirmed of him in regard of his *Eſſence*, rather than of his *Perſonality.* As belonging to the *Eſſence*, which is common to the *Three Perſons*, not as peculiar to the *Perſon* of the *Father.* Like as if it were ſaid, *David the King of Iſrael*, or *David the Father of Solomon*, is a *Reaſonable Creature*, or *endued with Reaſon*; this *being endued with Reaſon*, doth not belong to him as *King of Iſrael*, nor as *Father of Solomon*; but, as he is a *Man* (though denominated by theſe Relations,) and is equivalent to this, *The Man* (who is Father of *Solomon*, and King of *Iſrael*) is *endued with Reaſon.* So if it be ſaid, that *David King of Iſrael*, and He *onely*, was *Father of Solomon*: it is not intended, that he was ſo *as King of Iſrael* (much leſs, in that capacity *Onely*,) but rather, as the *Man* who

begot

begot him; though designed by that Character. So here; God the *Creator* is *the Onely True God*: and God the *Redeemer* likewise; (*Thus saith the Lord thy* **Redeemer** *the Holy One of Israel, the Lord of Hosts, I am the First and I am the Last, and beside ME there is no God, Isa.* 41. 14. *Isa.* 44. 6. applyed to Christ, *Rev.* 1. 8, 17. *Rev.* 22. 13, 16.) Shall we therefore argue, That *God the* **Redeemer** is the Onely True God, and *beside* **Him** there is *no God*, therefore not God the *Creator*? No, we must not so argue. For it is not *as Redeemer*, or *as Creator*, that he is the *Onely True God*, but *as God*. (It may be *prædicatio* καθ' αὐτὸ, but not καθ' ὅλου πρῶτον.) For he was *the Onely True God* from all *Eternity*; but it was *in Time* that he *made the World*, and was the *Redeemer* of Mankind.

And this both the *Arian*, and the *Socinian*, must needs acknowledge as to the place before us. For when Christ saith, *To know Thee (Father) the Onely True God*; it cannot (according to their Principles) be said of him as *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but as *God*. For if Christ be onely a *Titular* God, or a *Creature*-God, (as they would have it,) there was a time, or moment, when he *was not*, (ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν,) and therefore, when God was not *his Father*.

ther. But he was *the Onely True God* from all *Eternity;* and therefore muſt be here ſo called, not as *Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, but as *God.* Not according to his *Perſonality*, but according to his *Eſſence*; which, we ſay, is common to the *Three Perſons*: Who are the *ſame God*, though under different *Denominations.*

But theſe two latter Anſwers, (though they be True and Solid,) are not neceſſary to this place; becauſe it is not ſaid *Thee Onely.* Yet I here name them, becauſe they may be of uſe to anſwer ſome like Objection raiſed from ſome other place.

The full import of the words, is this, *That the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is that God, beſide which God, there is no other True God.* Or, *There is no other True God, beſide that God, which is the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And this we do fully agree with, when we ſay, That the *Son* and the *Holy-Ghoſt*, are not *another* God, but *the ſame* True God with the *Father.*

Objection II.

It may perhaps be next Objected, That though this place do not *Deny* the Son and Holy-Ghoſt to be the True God, (meaning thereby, the ſame God with the Father:) Yet neither doth it *Prove* them ſo to be. I an-

I anſwer. 'Tis true: This place alone, (without the concurrence of others) doth not *Prove* the *Trinity*. (And it is much if it ſhould, where there are but *Two* mentioned.) Nor is it brought by us to that purpoſe. We only Anſwer the Objections brought againſt it by others, from this place: And leave the Proof of it to be fetched from other places in concurrence with this.

I have obſerved elſewhere (*Lett.* 3.) that if we ſhould read it thus, *To know Thee to be the Onely True God; and him alſo whom thou haſt ſent, Jeſus Chriſt*, (as implying him alſo to be *the ſame* True God:) Or thus, *To know Thee, and (whom thou haſt ſent) Jeſus Chriſt, the Only True God*: The words will well bear it, without any force put upon them.

Nor is this only a new Notion of my own. For I (ſince) find, that S. *Auſtin* had ſaid the ſame long ago, in his *Epiſt.* 174. (ſpeaking to *Paſcentius*, an *Arian*, concerning this place) *De Patre tantummodo vos vultis intelligi, quod ait, Ut cognoſcant Te unum verum Deum, &, quem miſiſti, Jeſum Chriſtum; Ubi nos ſubaudimus, etiam Jeſum Chriſtum verum Deum: Ut hæc ſit ſententia, Te, &, quem miſiſti, Jeſum Chriſtum, cognoſcant unum verum Deum. Ne illa conſequatur abſurditas,*

ut,

ut, ſi propterea non eſt verus Deus Jeſus Chriſtus, quia dictum eſt Patri, Te unum verum Deum: propterea non ſit Dominus Pater, quia dictum eſt de Chriſto, Unus Dominus. Where he takes the meaning to be this, *To know Thee, and, whom thou haſt ſent, Jeſus Chriſt, the Onely True God*; which he backs with this Argument; Becauſe if we ſhould here on this account exclude the *Son* from being the *True God*; we might, for the ſame reaſon, exclude the *Father* from being the *Lord*, becauſe it is ſaid (1 *Cor.* 8. 6.) *One Lord, Jeſus Chriſt.*

Yet even this, though it might prove it, as to the *Son*, it would not hence conclude it, as to the *Holy-Ghoſt*. But the concurrence of other places, will prove it more clearly as to both. I ſhall ſhew it of each.

As to the *Son*, we have it clearly affirmed, by the ſame S. *John*, (who beſt underſtood the import of his own words) that he is alſo *the True God*; (ſo that it was not intended here to exclude him.) 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. *We are in him that is True, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt: This is the True God.* (And therefore not *onely* the Father.) And he had before told us (from Chriſt's own words) *Joh.* 10. 30. *I and my Father are One.*

Nor is it here meant of *one in Teſtimony*, as the

the *Socinians* would have it underſtood elſewhere, (there being in the Context here no mention of *Teſtimony* at all:) But it muſt be meant of *One God*. And this is manifeſt from the Inference which the *Jews* made from it. For they did thereupon *take up ſtones to ſtone him*, as for (what they call) *Blaſphemy*: *Becauſe thou* (ſay they) *being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God*, ver. 31, 32, 33. For which Inference there had been no Pretence, if by *One*, they had not underſtood *One God*.

And the High Prieſt in like manner, *Matth.* 26. 63, 64, 65. *I adjure thee* (ſaith he) *by the Living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Chriſt, the Son of God*; To which when Chriſt had anſwered, *Thou haſt ſaid*, (dicis quod res eſt,) *He rent his clothes, ſaying, He hath ſpoken Blaſphemy, What further need have we of witneſſes?* For to ſay that he was *the Chriſt, the Son of God*; or (as it is in *Mark* 14. 61.) *The Chriſt, the Son of the Bleſſed*; was underſtood by them to be the ſame, as to call himſelf *God*. Which had been *Blaſphemy*, had it not been *True*.

And what is ſaid of Chriſt, *Joh.* 10. 30. *I and the Father are One*; is ſaid of all *Three*, by the ſame St. *John*, (1 *Joh.* 5. 7.) *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; theſe Three are One.*

Objection III.

It is Objected, that these words, last cited, are said to have been wanting in some Translations, or some ancient Copies.

Answ. Be it so. And so are some whole Epistles wanting in some Translations. And considerable parts of some other Chapters. But we are not therefore to cast them away as not Genuine. The IId. and IIId. Epistles of St. *John*, and that of *Jude*, are said to have been wanting in the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Translations: And the Story of the *Woman taken in Adultery*, *Joh.* 8. wanting in the *Gothick* Gospels: And part of the last Chapter of St. *Mark*'s Gospel, is said to be wanting in some Books: And the *Doxology* in the close of the Lord's Prayer: And the like in divers others. But we must not thence conclude them not to be Genuine, and put them out of our Bibles, because they have chanced to be omitted in some Books.

And it is so far from being strange, that such Omissions should sometimes happen; that it is very strange (if there were not a great Providence of God to preserve the Scriptures pure and entire) that there should be no more such mistakes than what are found. For (before

(before the convenience of Printing was found out) when Copies were to be ſingly tranſcribed one from another, and even thoſe but in a few hands: 'Twas very poſſible, (and hardly avoidable,) even for a diligent Tranſcriber, ſometime to skip a line. Eſpecially, (which is the caſe here) when ſome of the ſame words do again recur after a line or two; Men are very ſubject, both in Writing and Printing, (as thoſe well know who are verſed in either,) to leap from one word, to the ſame recurring ſoon after. Nor is ſuch Omiſſion (when it happens) readily diſcerned, if (as here) the ſenſe be not manifeſtly diſturbed by it.

Now when ſuch variety of Copies happens (that words be found in ſome, which are wanting in others,) this muſt either happen by a Caſual miſtake, (without any deſign of Fraud:) or by a willful Falſification; as to ſerve a particular turn; (which I take to be the caſe of the Papiſts, *Indices Expurgatorii.*)

And, as to the words in queſtion; If the difference of Copies happened at firſt by a Caſual miſtake, (as I am apt to think,) 'tis very eaſy for a Tranſcriber (unawares) to *leave out* a Line which was in his Copy (eſpecially where ſuch omiſſion doth not ma-

nifeſtly diſturb the ſenſe ;) but not to *put in* a line which was not there. And, in ſuch caſe, the Fuller Copy is likelyeſt to be True, and the Omiſſion to be a Fault. Which happening (as it ſeems it did) ſome hundreds of years ago, in ſome one Copy ; it might eaſily paſs (unobſerved) into many others tranſcribed thence (and ſo to others derived from thoſe Tranſcripts.) But an *Inſertion* (of what was not in their Copy) muſt needs be willful, and not caſual.

On the other ſide ; If this variety of Copies were at firſt from a *willful Falſification* ; It is much more likely to be a willful *Omiſſion* of the *Arians*, in ſome of their Copies, (which might be done ſilently, and unobſerved ;) than by a willful *Inſertion* of the *Orthodox*.

For the Inſertion of ſuch a clauſe, if wholly New, and which had never before been Heard of ; would have been preſently detected by the *Arians*, as ſoon as ever it ſhould be urged againſt them.

Nor was any advantage to be made of it by the Orthodox, ſince the *Divinity of Chriſt* (which was the Point then in queſtion) might be as ſtrongly urged from that in St. *John*'s Goſpel, *I and the Father are One*, as from this

in

in his Epiſtle, *Theſe Three are One.* And therefore it is not likely that the Orthodox ſhould willfully make any ſuch Falſification, from whence they could promiſe themſelves no advantage. Nor do I find, it was ever charged upon them by the ancient *Arians* in thoſe days: though *Athanaſius* and others urged it againſt them. And in very ancient Copies, in which it had been left out, it is found ſupplied in the Margin, as having been faultily omitted.

And it is the more likely to be Genuine, becauſe in this clauſe (*The Father, the Word, and the Holy-Ghoſt*) the *ſecond Perſon* is called *ſimpliciter*, ὁ λόγος, *the Word*; which is St. *John*'s Language, both here, and in his Goſpel, *Joh.* 1. And is (I think) peculiar to him; and not ſo uſed by any other of the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament.

I do not deny but that this *ſecond Perſon* may be called the *Word of God*, in *Heb.* 11. 3. *By Faith we underſtand that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God.* And 2 Pet. 3. 5,7. *By the Word of God were the Heavens of old. and the Earth*, &c. *and by the ſame Word they are kept in ſtore.* As he is by the ſame St. *John*, Rev. 19. 13. *His name is called, the Word of God.* But to call him *the Word* abſolutely (without other addition) I think

think is peculiar to St. *John*. And therefore much more likely in this place, to have proceeded from the ſame *Pen*, and not to have been inſerted by an Interpolater ſome hundreds of years after. And that clauſe *Theſe Three are One*, in the Epiſtle, agreeing ſo well with *I and the Father are one* in the Goſpel, is a further confirmation of their being both from the ſame Pen.

Add to this, That the *Antitheſis* which we find in the *7th* and *8th Verſes*, is ſo very *Natural*; that it is a great Preſumption to be Genuine. *There are Three that bear record in Heaven, The Father, the Word, and the Holy-Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One: And there are Three that bear witneſs in Earth, The Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood, and theſe Three agree in One.* Which as it ſtands, is very Natural; but the latter clauſe would ſeem lame without the former; and the words *in Earth* wholly redundant in the latter, if not by *Antitheſis* to anſwer to the words *in Heaven*, in the former Verſe.

And that it was anciently ſo read, appears from St. *Cyprian*, by whom it is twice cited (in his Book *De Unitate Eccleſiæ*, and in his *Epiſtle ad Jubaianum*) before the *Arian* Controverſy was on foot.

In

In the former place, (arguing for the Church's *Unity*, not to be broken by *Schiſms*) he ſpeaks thus. *Dicit Dominus, Ego & Pater unum ſumus. Et iterum de Patre & Filio & Spiritu Sancto, ſcriptum eſt, Et hi tres unum ſunt. Et quiſquam credit hanc Unitatem de divina firmitate venientem, ſacramentis cœleſtibus cohærentem, ſcindi in Eccleſia poſſe?* That is, *Our Lord ſaith, I and the Father are One: And again, of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, It is Written, Theſe Three are One. And who can believe, that this Unity of the Church, proceeding from this Firm Union in God, and united by the Heavenly Sacraments, can be ſeparated in the Church?* Where he argues for the *Unity of the Church* (not to be divided by Schiſm) by two Arguments from this place. One from the *firm Unity of God*; noted in *ver.* 7. *The Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One*; from whom this Church proceeds, (*de divina firmitate venientem.*) The other, from their being United by the ſame *Sacraments* (*ſacramentis cœleſtibus cohærentem*) which relates to *ver.* 8. *The Spirit, the Water, and the Bloud agree in One.* Which double Argument, from the two Verſes, ſhew that, *then*, they were both read.

And, as to the former of them (which is that in queſtion) He cites it again, in his *Epiſtola*

Epiſtola ad Jubaianum; where, diſputing againſt *Baptiſm by Hereticks*, he thus argues; *Si baptizari quis apud Hæreticos potuit; utique & remiſſam peccatorum conſequi potuit. Si peccatorum remiſſam conſecutus eſt; & ſanctificatus eſt, & templum Dei factus eſt. Quæro, Cujus Dei? Si Creatoris; non potuit, qui in eum non credidit. Si Chriſti; nec hujus potuit fieri templum, qui negat Deum Chriſtum. Si Spiritus Sancti; [cum tres Unum ſint,] quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus eſſe ei poteſt, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus eſt?* That is; If by Heretitcks one could be baptized; then he might obtain remiſſion of ſins: If he obtain remiſſion of ſins; then is he ſanctified, and become the Temple of God. I ask then, of What God? Of the *Creator*? that he cannot be, who did not in *Him* believe. Of *Chriſt*? Neither can he be *His* Temple, who denies Chriſt to be God. Of the *Holy Ghoſt*? No. For, ſeeing *theſe Three are One*, How can the Holy Ghoſt be at Peace with him who is at Enmity with either the Father or the Son?

'Tis manifeſt therefore that, *Theſe Three are One*. was thus read in *Cyprian*'s time; as being by him twice cited, before the *Arian* Controverſie was on foot.

And (before him) it is cited by *Tertullian*, in his

his Book *adverſus Praxeam*, cap. 25. *Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero*: qui Tres Unum ſunt, (*non* Unus:) *quomodo dictum eſt*, Ego & Pater Unum ſumus; *ad ſubſtantiæ Unitatem, non ad Numeri Singularitatem.* Where he doth not only cite the place, but doth likewiſe Parallel and Compare, *Theſe Three are One*, (in this place) with *I and the Father are One*, (in the other place) as being of a like import. That is, The Connexion of the Father with the Son, and of the Son with the Paraclete or Holy Ghoſt, makes theſe coherent one with the other: *Which Three are ONE*, (*Unum* not *Unus*, One *Thing*, not One *Perſon*;) like as it is ſaid, *I and the Father are One*, (one *Thing*) as to the *Unity of Subſtance*, though not as to *Singularity of Number*. They are One *Being*, One *Subſtance*, though otherwiſe they may be *Three*.

'Tis therefore no New Interpolation; but was anciently ſo read by *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* (the two moſt ancient of the Latin Fathers) long before the *Arian* Controverſie was on foot. And hath been urged by others afterward, againſt the *Arians*.

Nor is there any prejudice (that I know of) againſt its being ſo read as now we read

it, ſave that ſome of the *Fathers* (it is ſaid) have omitted to Urge it againſt the *Arians*, when there hath been occaſion of ſo doing.

But this (beſide that it is onely a Negative Argument, and I know not how well grounded) might very well happen, if it chanced to be wanting in that particular Copy which ſuch Father uſed. (For we are not to ſuppoſe they had then ſuch plenty of Bibles as are now in our hands; but ſome one Manuſcript Copy was to ſerve many.) And becauſe that in St. *John*'s Goſpel, *I and the Father are One*, did fit their purpoſe as well, or rather better, than this in his Epiſtle, *Theſe Three are One*. For the Controverſie, then on foot, was not ſo much that of the *Trinity*, as that of the *Divinity of Chriſt*.

To return, therefore, to the place which is before us; From what hath been ſaid, it is manifeſt enough, that St. *John*, in calling the Father, *the Onely True God*, did not intend to exclude *the Son*, from being *the ſame* True God; whom himſelf doth elſewhere call *the True God* alſo, 1 *Joh.* 5. 20.

No more (I ſay) than what is ſaid, by name, of *God the Redeemer* (Iſa. 44. 6, 8.) is to be thought excluſive of *God the Creator*, or *God the Father*; *Thus ſaith the Lord, the* REDEEMER,

ER, the Lord of Hoſts, I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſide ME there is no God. Which is applied to Chriſt in particular, *Rev.* 22. 13, 16. But is not excluſive of the Father; becauſe God the *Creator* (or God the Father) is the *ſame God* with God the *Redeemer*, and therefore not *another God beſide him.* And therefore *both of them* (or rather, the ſame God under *both Conſiderations*) indifferently called (eſpecially in the Old Teſtament) *God* indefinitely, the *Lord of Hoſts*, the *Holy One of Iſrael.*

Nor is that which is ſaid of Chriſt, 1 *Tim.* 6. 14, 15, 16. *Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who Onely hath Immortality*, intended to exclude the *Father*; as if the *Father* were not alſo *Immortal*, or were not (what is there ſaid of Chriſt) *the bleſſed and onely Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords.* But only, that *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, is that *God*, which (God) is *the bleſſed and onely Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and who only hath Immortality.*

And (as was before noted by S. *Auſtin.*) The *Father* is not excluded from being *Lord*, notwithſtanding that of 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *To us there is but One God, the Father; and One Lord Jeſus Chriſt*: or that of *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. *One Lord, one Faith, One Baptiſm, one God and Father of all.* For

the Father, and the Son, are the ſame God, the ſame Lord. The ſame of whom it is ſaid, *Iſa.* 45. 5. *I am the Lord and there is none elſe, there is no God beſide me.* And again, *ver.* 6. *I am the Lord and there is none elſe.* Where note, that the Word *Father*, in that phraſe, *God and Father of All*, is different from the ſenſe of it, in *the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*: that relating to the common Nature; this to the Perſon.

And as in theſe places, what is ſaid of the *Son*, (that *he onely hath Immortality*, that he is the *onely Potentate*, that he is the *One Lord*, that *beſide him*, the Redeemer, *there is no God*,) are not to be underſtood *excluſive of the Father*; ſo what is here ſaid of the Father, (that he is *the Onely True God*) is not to be underſtood *excluſive of the Son*; who is not *another*, but *the ſame* True God.

I thought here to have inſerted (as in a proper place) a Diſcourſe of ſome other Points relating to the Trinity; which I find it neceſſary here to omit (or to defer it to ſome other occaſion) that I be not prevented by the time in what I have to ſay further.

That there is a God the *Creator*, a God the *Redeemer*, and a God the *Sanctifier*; and that theſe are *the ſame God*; I think cannot reaſonably be Denied. I ſhall ſhew it of each. As

As to *God* the *Creator*, we are told, *Gen.* 1. 1. *In the beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth.* (And, to the ſame purpoſe, in many other places.) And, I think, there is none doubts, but that this *Creator*, is the *True God*, the *Supreme* God. And in *Jer.* 10. 11. God doth by this Character diſtinguiſh himſelf from all other (pretended) Gods, *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, they ſhall periſh from the Earth, and from under theſe Heavens.*

As to God the *Redeemer*; *I know that my Redeemer liveth*, ſaith *Job*, *Ch.* 19. 25. By which *Redeemer* doubtleſs he meant the *Living* God, a God who did *then Live*; a God who was, *then*, *in Being*, and not (as the *Socinians* would have us think) who was not to *Be*, till Two Thouſand years after. And *Iſa.* 44. 6. *Thus ſaith the Lord the Redeemer, the Lord of Hoſts, I am the firſt and I am the laſt, and beſide Me there is no God.* Which *Redeemer*, muſt needs be the ſame God, with God the *Creator*, the *Lord of Hoſts.*

As to God the *Sanctifier*; *Purge me with hyſſop* (ſaith *David*) *and I ſhall be clean; waſh me, and I ſhall be whiter than ſnow: Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right ſpirit within me*, (*Pſal.* 51. 7, 10.) Which certainly are works of *Sanctification*; and the *God*, to whom *David* prayed,

prayed, is doubtless the *Living God*, a God *when a Being*. And when God promiseth to *Israel*, *I will give them a heart to know me; and they shall return unto me with their whole heart*, Jer. 24. 7. *I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever; I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me*, Jer. 32. 39, 40. *I will give them one heart, and put a new spirit within them; I will take away the heart of stone and give them a heart of flesh*, Ezek. 11. 19. and 36. 26. *I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts*, Jer. 31. 33. *The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayst live*, Deut. 30. 6. All these are *sanctifying* works; and that God who doth them, is *God* the *Sanctifier*. And it is the same God, who doth thus *Sanctifie*, that is the *Creator* and the *Redeemer*.

Now this God the *Creator*, God the *Redeemer*, and God the *Sanctifier*, I take to be the same with what we otherwise call, God the *Father*, God the *Son*, and God the *Holy Ghost*. And our Church doth so expound it in her Catechism; *First, I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath Made me and all the World: Secondly, In God the Son, who hath Redeemed me and all Mankind:*

kind: *Thirdly, In God the Holy Ghoſt, who Sanctifieth me and all the Elect people of God.* And it is no more abſurd or inconſiſtent, to ſay, *that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghoſt, are the ſame God*; than to ſay, *that God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, are the ſame God.*

As they ſtand related to us, they are called God the *Creator*, God the *Redeemer*, and God the *Sanctifier*. As to the different Oeconomy, amongſt themſelves, one is called the *Father*, who is ſaid to *Beget*; another the *Son*, who is ſaid to be *Begotten*; a third, the *Holy-Ghoſt*, who is ſaid to *Proceed* or *Come forth*; But are all *the ſame God.*

Objection IV.

But then here I meet with another Objection, on which the *Socinians* lay great weight. If *God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier*, or *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghoſt*, be the *ſame God*, they cannot then be *Three Perſons*: And if they be *Three Perſons*, they muſt be *Three Gods.* For like as *Three Perſons*, amongſt *Men*, doth ſignifie *Three Men*; ſo *Three Perſons*, who are *God*, muſt be *Three Gods.* Contrary to the *Firſt Commandment*, which allows us to have *but One God.* To

To which I anſwer; *Firſt*, This is only to cavil at a *Word*, when they have nothing of moment againſt the *Thing*. So that if inſtead of ſaying *Theſe Three Perſons are One God*, we ſay, *Theſe Three are One God*, or give them another *Name* inſtead of *Perſons*, or ſay *theſe Three Somewhats*, without giving them a *Name*, this Objection is at an end.

2. I ſay further; 'Tis very true, that, in our *Engliſh Tongue*, by another *Perſon*, we *ſometimes* underſtand another *Man*, (becauſe that other *Perſon* is, very often, another *Man* alſo.) But it is not always ſo; nor is that the proper Signification of the Word; but an Abuſive ſenſe put upon it.

And the reaſon of uſing the word *Perſon* in this abuſive or improper ſenſe; is, for want of an *Engliſh* word to anſwer the *Latin* word *Homo*, or the *Greek* ἄνθρωπος, which might indifferently relate to both *Sexes*.

For the word *Man* doth properly relate to the *Male*, and *Woman* to the *Female*. And if the word *Man* be ſometimes ſo uſed as to imply the *Woman* alſo; it is (by a *Synecdoche*) putting the Name of One Sex, to ſignifie Both. And 'tis for want of ſuch a Word (which might indifferently relate to both Sexes) that we ſometime

time make uſe of *Perſon* in a borrowed ſenſe, rather than to uſe a *Circumlocution* of *Man and Woman*, by naming both Sexes.

And if we ſhould uſe ſuch Circumlocution of *Man and Woman*; yet even this would not reach the whole *Species*. For we do not uſe to call them *Man* and *Woman*, till they be of a conſiderable *Age*; before which time they are called *Children*; and therefore to comprehend the whole *Species*, we ſay, *Man, Woman, and Child.*

We do indeed, ſometimes, to that purpoſe, make uſe of the word *Mankind*, (adding the word *kind* to that of *Man*, to Ampliate the Signification of it.) But this relates only to *Genus Humanum* in a *Collective* ſenſe; not to *Homines* taken *Diſtributively*. For we do not ſay *a Mankind, two Mankinds*, &c. as we ſay *Homo, Homines.*

We are fain, therefore, for want of a proper *Engliſh* word, to make uſe of *Perſon* in a borrowed ſenſe to anſwer the Latin *Homo.*

But the Ancient *Fathers*, who firſt applied the word *Perſona* to the Sacred *Trinity*, did not *ſpeak Engliſh.* And therefore we cannot, from the preſent uſe of the word *Perſon* in our Language, conclude in what ſenſe they uſed the word *Perſona.*

3. Again; the *Schoolmen* in later Ages, have yet put another ſenſe on the word *Perſona*, peculiar to themſelves; extending it indifferently to *Men* and *Angels*; (for want of a proper word of that Extent;) ſo as to ſignifie (with them) what they call *Suppoſitum Rationale*, or what we call *a Reaſonable Creature*. (And, in imitation of them, ſome others have ſince ſo uſed it.) But this is a New ſenſe, of later Ages, ſince the time of thoſe Fathers, (nor do the Schoolmen, in this ſenſe, without a *Metaphor*, apply it to the Sacred Trinity.) We cannot therefore conclude from hence, What was the Fathers ſenſe of it.

4. To find out therefore the true ſenſe of the word *Perſon* as applied to the *Trinity*; we are not ſo much to conſider, what now-a-days the word doth ſometime ſignifie with us in *Engliſh*; nor what ſenſe the *Schoolmen* have put upon it ſince the time of thoſe Fathers: As, what was the true ſenſe of the word *Perſona*, at or before their times, in approved *Latin* Authours. Which is quite another thing from either of theſe ſenſes.

For what in *Engliſh* we ſometimes mean by *Three Perſons* (taken indifferently for *Men, Women, and Children,*) the *Latins* would not have called

called *tres Personas*, but *tres Homines*: Though, if considered in such Relations, as *Father*, *Mother*, and *Child*, they might so be called *tres Personæ*.

Nor do I find that in approved *Latin* Authours, the word *Persona* was wont to be attributed by them (as by the Schoolmen it hath since been) to *Angels*; nor to their *Genii*, or *Heathen Gods*.

But, 5. It did signifie *the State, Quality, or Condition of a Man, as he stands Related to other Men.* (And so I find the *Latin* word *Persona* Englished in our Dictionaries.) Suppose, as a *King*, a *Subject*, a *Father*, a *Son*, a *Neighbour*, a *Publick* or *Private Person*, a *Person of Honour*, and the like. And so, as the *Condition* varied, the *Person* varied also, though the same *Man* remained. As if an *ordinary Person*, be first made a *Knight*, and then a *Lord*; the *Person* or *Condition* is varied, but he is still *the same Man* that he was before. And he that is this Year, a *Lord Mayor*, may be, next Year, but an *Alderman*, or not so much.

Hence are those *Latin* Phrases, frequent in approved Authours; *Personam imponere* (to put a Man into an *Office*, or confer a *Dignity* upon him;) *Induere personam* (to take upon him the Office;) *Sustinere personam* (to Bear an Office,

or Execute an Office;) *Deponere perſonam* (to Reſign the Office, or lay it down;) ſo, *Agere perſoniam* (to Act a Perſon,) and many the like.

So that there is nothing of *Contradiction*, nothing of *Inconſiſtence*, nothing *Abſurd* or *Strange* in it, for the *ſame Man* to ſuſtain *divers Perſons*, (either ſucceſſively, or at the ſame Time;) or *divers Perſons* to meet in *the ſame Man*; according to the true and proper Notion of the word *Perſon*. A Man may, at the ſame time, ſuſtain the Perſon of a *King*, and of a *Father*, if inveſted with *Regal* and *Paternal* Authority; (and theſe Authorities may be *Subordinate* one to another;) and he may accordingly Act ſometime as a *King*, and ſometime as a *Father*. Thus *Tully*, (who well underſtood the Propriety of *Latin* words) *Suſtineo Unius tres Perſonas; meam, Adverſarii, Judicis*, (I being One and the ſame Man, ſuſtain Three Perſons; That of my Own, that of my Adverſary, and that of the Judge.) And *David* was, at the ſame time, *Son* of *Jeſſe*, *Father* of *Solomon*, and *King* of *Iſrael*.

And this takes away the very Foundation of their Objection; Which proceeds upon this Miſtake, as if *Three Perſons* (in a proper ſenſe) muſt needs imply *Three Men*. 6. Now

6. Now if *Three Perſons* (in the proper ſenſe of the word Perſon) may be *One Man*; what hinders but that *Three Divine Perſons* (in a ſenſe Metaphorical) may be *One God*? What hinders but that *the ſame God*, conſidered as the Maker and Sovereign of all the World, may be God the *Creator*, or God the *Father*; and the ſame God conſidered, as to his ſpecial Care of Mankind, as the Ruthour of our Redemption, be God the *Redeemer*, or God the *Son*; and the ſame God, as working effectually on the Hearts of his Elect, be God the *Sanctifier*, or God the *Holy-Ghoſt*?

And what hinders but that the *ſame God*, diſtinguiſhed according to theſe *three Conſiderations*, may fitly be ſaid to be *Three Perſons*? Or (if the word *Perſon* do not pleaſe) *Three Somewhats* that are but *One God*?

And this ſeems to me a Full and Clear Solution of that Objection, which they would have to be thought Inſuperable.

Objection V.

It may perhaps be Objected further, Why muſt we needs make uſe of the word *Perſon*; and call them *Three Perſons*, if Three *Somewhats* will ſerve as well?

I an-

I answer, *First*, We have no such need of the word *Person*, but that we can spare it. *Hypostasis* will serve our turn as well. And if they think the *Latin* word *Persona*, be not a good Translation of the *Greek Hypostasis*; Let them retain the *Greek* word. (We mean the same by both.) And then perhaps they will find themselves at a loss, to fasten some of their Objections upon the word *Hypostasis*, which they would fasten upon *Persona*.

2. But, *Secondly*, If the *Thing* be thus far agreed, That these *Three Somewhats* (thus considered) may be *One God*: I see not why they should contend with us about the *Name Person*. For this is only to quarrel about a *Word*, or *Name*, when the *Notion* is agreed.

3. If it were admitted (which I see no reason for) that the word *Person* doth not fitly express that *Notion* which it is intended to design; the most that can be inferred from it, is but, That we have not given it so fit a *Name*: And, to cavil at that, when the Notion intended by it is understood; were just as if one should argue, There never was such a *Man*, as whom they called *Pope Pius*; because the *Man*, who was so called, was not a *Pious* Man.

4. But

4. But I ſee not why the word *Perſon* ſhould not be thought a very fit word for this purpoſe.

For Two of theſe Three are repreſented to us in Scripture under the Names of *Father* and *Son*; and this Son as *Begotten* of the Father; (and therefore *theſe* Names are not to be quarrelled with:) But all this in a *Metaphorical* ſenſe; (For no Man can ſuppoſe, that this *Father* doth ſo *Beget* this *Son*, as theſe words do *properly* ſignifie amongſt Men).

Now the Relations of *Father* and *Son*, in a *proper* ſenſe, are ſuch as are properly denoted by the word *Perſona*, in its proper Acceptation.

And conſequently the *Father* and *Son*, in a *Metaphorical* ſenſe, may (by a Continuation of the ſame Metaphor) be fitly called *Perſons*, in that Metaphorical ſenſe. And in what ſenſe they be *Father* and *Son*, in a like ſenſe they be *Perſons*, according to the Propriety of the *Latin* word *Perſona*. For ſuch *Relatives* the *Latins* called *Perſonas*.

And if the *Father* and *Son* may fitly be ſo called; no doubt but the *Holy Ghoſt* may be ſo called alſo, as One *Proceeding* or *Coming forth* (ἐκπορευόμενον) from them. As in *Joh.* 14. 26.

The

The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in My name, he will teach you all things. And *Joh.* 15. 26. *The Comforter, whom I will ſend you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He ſhall teſtifie of Me.* Where it is manifeſt, that, in what ſenſe the *Father* and *Son* are to be reputed *Perſons*; the *Comforter* or *Holy Ghoſt*, is, in the ſame ſenſe, *ſo* to be reputed.

So that (I think) I have clearly Vindicated, not only the *Notion*, That theſe Three *Somewhats* may be *One God*; But the *Name* alſo, That theſe *Somewhats*, may fitly be called *Perſons*.

Objection VI.

I ſhall name but one Objection more, which when I have ſatisfied, I ſhall conclude for this time.

That *6th.* Objection (and 'tis but a weak one) is this. The *Trinitarians* do not all agree, but differ among themſelves, in expreſſing their Notions in this Matter.

Very well. And do not the *Antitrinitarians* differ much more? Doth not the *Arian* and the *Socinian* differ as much from one another, as either of them do from us; (and *declare* that they ſo do?) And do not the *Arians* among themſelves,

ſelves, and the *Socinians* amongſt themſelves, differ more than do the *Trinitarians*? Certainly they do.

It muſt be confeſſed, that different Men, as well in the ſame as in different Ages, have very differently expreſſed themſelves, according to their different Sentiments of *Perſonality*; and of the particular *Diſtinctions* of the three Perſons among themſelves.

But ſo it is in all the moſt obvious things in the world. As, in *Time*, *Place*, *Space*, *Motion*, and the like. We are all apt to think, that we all know well enough, what we mean by thoſe Words, till we be asked. But if we be put to it, to expreſs our ſelves concerning any of them, *What it is*, whether a *Thing*, or *Nothing*, or *not a Thing*, or *ſomewhat of a Thing*, and *what that ſomewhat is*; it would be long enough before we ſhould all agree to expreſs our ſelves juſt in the ſame manner; and, *ſo clearly*, as that no man who hath a mind to cavil, could find occaſion ſo to do. I might ſay the like of *Heat* and *Cold*; of *Light*, *Sight*, and *Colour*; of *Smells*, and *Taſts*, and the different *Sorts* of them.

Can we never be ſaid to agree in this, That *the Fire doth Burn and Conſume the Wood*; till we be all agreed *what is the Figure of thoſe Fiery Atoms* (and what their *Motion*, and from what *Impulſe*) which *enter the Pores of the Wood*, and *ſeparate its parts*, and convert ſome of them to *Smoak*, ſome to *Flame*, and ſome to *Aſhes*; and *which to which*; and in what *manner* all this is done?

What a folly then is it to require that, in the things of God, we ſhould all *ſo* agree as to expreſs our thoughts *juſt in the ſame manner*; as is not poſſible to do in the moſt obvious things we meet with?

And, in ſuch a caſe as wherein to expreſs our Notions, we have no Words but *Figurative*, it is not to be thought ſtrange, that one man ſhould make uſe of *one Metaphor*, and another of *another*, according as their ſeveral Fanſies ſerve.

But thus far, I think, the Orthodox are all agreed; That between theſe *Three*, which the Scripture calls *The Father*, *the Son*, *and the Holy Ghoſt*, or *the Father*, *the Word*, *and the Spirit*, there is a *Diſtinction*, greater than that of (what we call) the *Divine Attributes*; but not ſo as to be *Three Gods*. And this Diſtinction,

ſtinction, they have thought fit to denote by the Word *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Perſon*.

They are alſo all agreed; that one of theſe Perſons (namely the *Son* or the *Word*) was *Incarnate*, or *Made Fleſh*, and did take to himſelf our *Humane Nature*.

But as to the particular *Modes*, or *Manner How*; either how theſe two *Natures* are *United*, or how theſe three *Perſons* are *Diſtinguiſhed* each from other: we may be content to be *Ignorant*, farther than God hath been pleaſed to Reveal to us.

We know that our *Immortal Soul* is joined with an *Humane Body*, ſo as to make *One Man* (without ceaſing, *that* to be a *Spirit*, and *this* to be a *Body*:) But 'tis hard for us to ſay *How*. And accordingly we ſay, that *the Man Chriſt Jeſus*, (without ceaſing to be *Man*,) and *God manifeſted in the Fleſh*, (without ceaſing to be *God*,) are *One Chriſt*: But what kind of *Union* this is, which we call *Hypoſtatical*, we do not throughly underſtand. We know alſo that the *Father* is ſaid to *Beget*, the *Son* to be *Begotten*, the *Holy Ghoſt* to *Proceed*: But neither do we fully underſtand the import of theſe Words; nor is it needful that we ſhould.

But, so far as was said before, we do all agree; and we may safely rest there.

Now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; three Persons, but One God; be Honour, and Glory, and Praise, now and for ever.

The End of the Second Sermon.

A Third SERMON Concerning the TRINITY.

Joh. xvij. 3.

Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε, τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the onely true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

I Have, in a former Discourse from this Verse, entered upon the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; not so much, as being contained in it, as occasioned by it.

I have shewed that the word *Onely* is here restrictive, not of the Subject *Thee*, but of the Predicate *True God*. Affirming *the Father* to be *the Onely True God*, though not *the Father Onely*. Nor is it exclusive of *the Son*, who is also the same *True God*; and is so expressly called, by this same Writer, 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. where (speaking of *Jesus*

ſus Chriſt) he ſays, *This is the True God, and Eternal Life*; as if it were ſpoken with a direct aſpect to the words before us.

Now that *Chriſt* is often called *God*, neither the *Arians* nor the *Socinians* do deny. And it is ſo frequent, and ſo evident, as not to be denyed. Not only in the place laſt cited, but in many others. *Thy throne, O God endureth for ever*, Heb. 1. 8. *The Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Joh. 1. 1. *My Lord and my God.* Joh. 20. 28. *The Being over all, God bleſſed for ever, Amen.* (Or, *the Supreme Being, the ever bleſſed God.* Rom. 9. 5.) And elſewhere.

Objection VII.

But to this they Object, That though he be ſometime called *God*; yet by *God* is not there meant the *Supreme God*: But either a mere *Titular* God, as the *Socinians* will have it; (as one of the λεγόμενοι Θεοὶ, 1 *Cor.* 8. 5. one who is *called God*, but indeed *is not*, but a *mere Man* however highly dignified.) Or (as the *Arians* will have it) that he is *God* indeed, but not the *Supreme God*, not the ſame God with the Father, but an *Inferiour* God, (*Deus factus*) a *made*-God, a *Creature-God*; who was indeed *before the World*, but not from *Eternity*, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, there was (a Time, a Moment, a *Quando*) when he *was not*, when he had not a Being.

In Anſwer to both which; I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, (by the moſt ſignal *Characters*, whereby the *Supreme* God, the *Onely* true God, is ſet forth to us in Scripture; and by which he is therein Diſtinguiſhed from all falſe Gods, or other *pretended* Gods;) that Chriſt is the *True* God, the *Supreme* God, the *ſame God* with the Father, and not *another* God.

CHA-

CHARACTER I.

The first Character, which we meet with, of this God, is that of *Gen.* 1. 1. *In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.* Which I think no man doubts but to be meant of the *True* God, the *Supreme* God. And by virtue of this, he claims the Sovereignty thereof; *The Earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,* Psal. 24. 1. *Jehovah, the Lord of all the Earth,* Josh. 3. 11, 13. *The God of the Heaven, and the God of the Earth,* Gen. 24. 3. *The Heaven is my Throne, and the Earth is my Footstool,* Isa. 66. 1. *Behold the Heaven, and the Heaven of Heavens, is the Lord's, the Earth also, and all that is therein,* Deut. 10. 14.

The same Character is applied to God very often, *Isa.* 42. 5, 8. *Thus saith God the Lord* (Jehovah) *he that created the Heavens and stretched them out; he that spread forth the Earth and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I am the Lord* (Jehovah) *that is my name, and my Glory will I not give unto another.* And *Isa.* 48. 13. *Mine hand hath laid the foundation of the Earth, and my right hand hath spanned* (or *spread out*) *the Heavens.* So *Psal.* 8. 3. *When I consider the Heavens, the work of Thy fingers; the Moon and the Stars which thou hast ordained.* Psal. 146. 6. *Which made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that therein is.* And many other places, not only in the Old Testament; but in the New Testament likewise; as *Acts* 14. 15. *That ye should turn from these vanities unto the Living God, who made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea and all things that are therein.* And *Acts* 17. 24. *God that made the World, and all things therein.* So *Revel.* 4. 11. *Thou hast created all things.* Chap. 14. 7. *Him that made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Water.*

And it is the distinctive Character, whereby he doth distinguish

diſtinguiſh himſelf from all other pretended Gods, *Jer.* 10. Where he who at *ver.* 10. is called *The Lord, the true God, the living God, an everlaſting King, at who's wrath the Earth ſhall tremble, and the Nations ſhall not abide his indignation;* doth at *ver.* 11. give this defiance to all other Gods, *Thus ſhall ye ſay to them; The Gods which have not made the Heavens and the Earth, they ſhall periſh from the Earth, and from under theſe Heavens.*

Now this Character we find aſcribed to Chriſt. Not only, where it is ſpoken as of God indefinitely, but to be underſtood of Chriſt; (as are ſome of the places already mentioned:) But even where it is particularly applied to him.

I ſhall begin with that of *Joh.* 1. 1, 2. where we have a large Diſcourſe of him, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Where, by the *Word* is meant *Chriſt*, as is evident from the further deſcriptions of him in the following verſes; 'Tis he of whom *John the Baptiſt* came to *bear witneſs, ver.* 7, 8. He who *came into the World, but the World knew him not. ver.* 10. Who *came to his own, but his own received him not; but to as many as received him, he gave power to become the Sons of God. ver.* 11. 12. Who *was made fleſh, and dwelt amongſt us, and we beheld his glory; the glory as of the onely begotten of the Father. ver.* 14. He of whom *John bare witneſs and cryed, ſaying, This is he of whom I ſpake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me;* (not as to his Humane Nature; for, ſo, *John the Baptiſt* was older than he, by *ſix months*, Luk. 1. 26.) *and of his fulneſs* (ſaith St. *John*) *we have all received grace for grace; For the Law was given by Moſes, but grace and truth came by Jeſus Chriſt, ver.* 15, 16, 17. 'Twas *Jeſus Chriſt* therefore that is here called *the Word.*

Now of *this ſame Word*, it is ſaid, *The ſame was in the beginning with God; All things were made by him, and without*

out him was not any thing made which was made, ver. 2, 3. He *was in the World, and the World was made by him*, ver. 10. Conſonant to that of *Heb.* 11. 3. *The Worlds were framed by the Word of God:* and 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. *By the Word of God the Heavens were of old, and the Earth ſtanding in the Water and out of the Water.* And *by the ſame Word, the heavens and earth are kept in ſtore*, or *preſerved*, ver. 7.

And to the ſame purpoſe, *Col.* 1. 16, 17. *By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth. And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt.* And Heb. 1. 2. *By whom alſo he made the Worlds.*

In *Pſal.* 102. we have a long Prayer (to the *Supreme God* doubtleſs) which bears this title, *A Prayer of the Afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord,* (the Lord *Jehovah.*) It begins thus, *Hear my Prayer, O Lord,* (Jehovah) *and let my cry come unto thee.* And at the ſame rate he proceeds, addreſſing himſelf to the ſame God all along. And at ver. 24, 25, 26, 27. he ſpeaks thus, *O my God, thy years are throughout all Generations; Thou of old haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of thy hands*; (who is the *ſame God* therefore of whom *Moſes* had before ſaid, *In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*, Gen. 1. 1.) *They ſhall periſh* (as the Pſalmiſt proceeds) *but thou ſhalt endure: Yea all of them ſhall wax old as a Garment, as a veſture ſhalt thou change them and they ſhall be changed: But thou art the ſame, and thy years ſhall have no end.* And doubtleſs the Pſalmiſt, when he made this long Prayer, thought not of addreſſing himſelf to any other than the *Supreme God.* (Not to a God who had not, *then*, a Being, nor was to have till a *Thouſand Years* after, as the *Socinians* would have us think of Chriſt.) He prays to *God* as his *Redeemer*; that is, to Chriſt.

And that *Chriſt* is *that God* to whom he did thus addreſs, we are expreſly told, *Heb.* 1. 8, 10, 11, 12.

But unto the Son he ſaith,----Thou, Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine hands; They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt: and they all ſhall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed; but thou art the ſame, and thy years ſhall not fail. All which is plainly cited from that Pſalm. Chriſt therefore is *that God* to whom that Prayer was made; the ſame *Supreme God*, who *created the Heaven and the Earth*: even *Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday and to day and for ever*, Heb. 13. 8.

And it is very frequent in Scripture, that what in one place is ſpoken of God *Indefinitly* (without ſpecification of this or that Perſon) is elſewhere applied to one or other of the Perſons in particular, as that of the Creation is here to *Chriſt*, the *Redeemer*; as being the *ſame God* who is the *Creator* alſo. And that of *Redemption*, to God the *Creator* (who is the *Redeemer* alſo) *Iſai.* 43. 1. *Thus ſaith the LORD* (Jehovah) *that Created thee,---- Fear not, for I have Redeemed thee.* So that *God the Creator*, and *God the Redeemer*, are *the ſame God.*

CHARACTER II.

The next Character I ſhall inſiſt upon, is that whereby *God* denotes himſelf to *Moſes*, Exod. 3. 13, 14, 15. *I Am that I AM*; and *I AM hath ſent me unto you.* When God was ſending *Moſes* to the *Children of Iſrael*, in order to their deliverance out of *Egypt*, *Moſes* puts this Queſtion, *When I come to the Children of Iſrael, and ſhall ſay to them, The God of your Fathers hath ſent me unto you; and they ſhall ſay, What is his Name? What ſhall I ſay to them?* 'Tis certainly, therefore the True God, that is here ſpoken of: Let us ſee what is the Character that this God gives of himſelf. *And God ſaid unto Moſes, I AM THAT I AM: And he ſaid, Thus ſhalt thou ſay to the Children of Iſrael, I AM hath ſent me unto you.* This therefore is a proper Character of the True God.

God. *I am that I am*, (Ehjeh aſher Ehjeh,) or *I am, who AM*; or *I am, He who AM*, ſo the vulgar Latin; (*Ego ſum QUI SUM*;) and (QUI EST) *He that IS, hath ſent me*: As if, what God ſays of himſelf (in the firſt Perſon) *I that AM*, were proper for *Moſes* to ſay of him (in the third perſon) *He that IS*. And ſo the *Septuagint*, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ὢν, *I am, He that AM*, or *He that IS*; and ὁ Ὢν (*He that IS*) *hath ſent me*. Where *ſimply TO BE*, is made a Diſtinctive Character of God, as he whoſe Eſſence is *To be*; and it is *Impoſſible* for him *Not to Be*. Who *IS of Himſelf* (or rather *Himſelf IS*) without deriving ought from any other; and from whom all other Beings, have their Being. *Who giveth to all, life and breath and all things*; *In whom we live and move and have our Being*, Act. 17. 27, 28. *Who hath firſt given to him?* that is, *None hath*: He receives nothing (*aliunde*) from ought elſe; but *of him, and through him, and to him are all things*, Rom. 11. 35, 36. who is therefore called ὁ Ὤν.

The ſame notion the Heathens alſo had of the Supreme God. Hence *Ariſtotle* calls him Ὄν Ὄντων, *the Being of Beings*; and *Plato* αὐτὸ Ὄν, the ſelf *Being*; who *himſelf IS*, and *gives Being* to all elſe.

And (being thus *ſelf-exiſtent*) he muſt be alſo a *Neceſſary* Being (*Ens Neceſſarium*) and *Eternal*, (for if *ever* he had *not been*, it were impoſſible he ſhould ever *Be*; for how could *Nothing* make it ſelf *to be*:) and likewiſe *Infinite* (as the *Source* of all Being.) All which the Heathen acknowledged (as conſonant to Natural Light) as well as We.

Now this ſame Character *I Am*, or ὁ Ὤν (which is the word whereby the Greek Septuagint doth here render the Hebrew word *Ehjeh*, which we tranſlate *I AM*) that is *I who AM*, or *He who IS*, we find ſignally applied to *Chriſt*, Rom. 9. 5. *He that IS*. For what there

we render, *Who IS*, in the Greek is not ὃς ἐστι, but ὁ Ὤν, *He that IS*, or *the Being*: With this addition, *over all*; (*the Being, over all*, or the *Supreme Being*:) with this further Character, *God Bleſſed for ever*; (or *the ever bleſſed God.*) *Amen.*

Where it is not amiſs to note, that *the Bleſſed* (ὁ εὐλογητὸς) was an uſual Title whereby they were wont to deſign the *True God*. And accordingly, that queſtion which *Caiaphas* the High Prieſt, puts to our Saviour, *Mat.* 26. 63. *I adjure thee by the Living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be the Chriſt, the Son of God*; is in *Mark* 14. 53. *Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the* Bleſſed, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Εὐλογητοῦ. Where no man doubts but that by ὁ Εὐλογητὸς, is meant, the *Supreme God*. And when *Chriſt* is here called, ὁ Ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, (*the Supreme Being, the ever-Bleſſed God*;) with the Solemn note of Aſſeveration, *Amen*: It is certainly too Auguſt a Title for any leſs than the *Supreme God*, the *Only God*.

The ſame Character we have of him again, *Rev.* 1. 8. where we have not only the Title ὁ Ὤν, importing his *Being*, but the additional intimation of his *Eternity*, through all the variety of continued Duration, *paſt*, *preſent*, and *to come*.

Where we are to obſerve, that at *ver.* 4. we have this Character of *God* indefinitely, without reſtriction to this or that Perſon in the Deity, (as appears by its being contradiſtinct to Chriſt *perſonally* conſidered, *ver.* 5.) *Grace be unto you and peace,* (ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ Ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) *from him which Is, and which Was, and which is to come,---- and from Jeſus Chriſt*, &c.

Where it is manifeſt from the unuſual conſtruction, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ Ὤν, &c. that the Title ὁ Ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, (*who is, and was, and ſhall be*) is taken, τεχνικῶς, as the Grammarians ſpeak, (as one *undeclined-Subſtantive*,

ſtantive joined with the Article τῦ) as being (all together) one joint title of God, *Indefinitely taken*, (becauſe of that contradiſtinction which follows; *And from Jeſus Chriſt*;) and with particular reſpect (as the Margin of our Bible directs) to that of *Exod.* 3. 14. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ὤν, *I am* ὁ Ὤν, or *He who A M*; and can relate to none but the *Supreme God*.

Now what is thus ſaid of *this God* indefinitely, at *ver.* 4. is again repeated of *Chriſt* in particular at *ver.* 8. (with a further addition of *Omnipotence*,) *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending* (the Firſt and the Laſt) *ſaith the Lord, which Is, and which Was, and which is to Come; the Almighty*. So that he is here deſign'd, not only by his Abſolute *Being*; but by his *Eternity* alſo, through all variety of continued duration, (paſt, preſent, and future;) *who Is, and Was, and ſhall Be*; who was the *Firſt* (before whom nothing was) and the *Laſt* (after whom nothing ſhall be;) and, by his *Omnipotence, the Almighty*.

The ſame title of *Alpha and Omega, the Firſt and the Laſt*, is given him in divers other places; as at *ver.* 11, and 17. of the ſame Chapter, *I am Alpha and Omega, the Firſt and the Laſt*; *I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen.* And *Rev.* 2. 8. *The firſt and the laſt, which was dead and is alive.* And again, *Rev.* 21. 6. and *Rev.* 22. 13. All relating to *Iſai.* 41. 4. *Iſai.* 44. 6. *Iſai.* 48. 12. where the like had before been ſaid, as a Character (no doubt) of the *True God*. And *Iſai.* 43. 10. *Before me there was no God formed, neither ſhall there be after me.*

And what can this be other than the *Infinite*, the *Eternal*, the *Almighty* God. *The ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever*, as he is called, *Heb.* 13. 8. *The Bleſſed, and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who only hath Immortality*, &c. as he is deſcribed,

1 *Tim.*

1 *Tim.* 6. 14, 15, 16. And again, *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*, Rev. 17. 14. *and* Rev. 19. 16. *The Great God, and our Saviour*, Tit. 2. 13. Where, *our Saviour*, is so contra-distinguished, not as *another* from *the Great God*, but as another Title of that same Person: He that is *our God and Saviour*, or *God our Saviour*, as it is *Tit.* 3. 4. (like as *God and the Father*, Ephes. 5. 2. and again, *Col.* 3. 17. *Giving thanks to God, and the Father.*) For 'tis manifest that here (*Tit.* 2. 13.) it is spoken of Christ's coming to judgment; which is here called, *the Glorious appearance of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ*; that is, *the glorious appearance of Jesus Christ, who is the Great God and our Saviour*; The title that *Jeremy* gives to God, *Jer.* 32. 18. *The great and mighty God, the Lord of Hosts is his name.* *Christ* therefore, *our Saviour, is* ὁ μέγας Θεὸς, *the Great God.*

And the Doxology there added, *Rev.* 1. 6. *To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen*; is equivalent to that of Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς, Rom. 9. 5. *God blessed for ever.* And the like, 1 *Tim.* 6. 16. *To whom be Honour and Power everlasting, Amen.* And much more, that of *Rev.* 5. 12, 13, 14. *Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing:* (As High a Doxology as that in the close of the Lords-prayer;) To which we have the Acclamation of *every Creature (which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are therein,) saying, Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. And the four Beasts said, Amen; And the four and twenty Elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.* Too great things to be said of a mere Creature, or a Titular God; but very agreeable to Christ, being (as he is) *the same God with the Father*, the *only True God.*

I might here add a like Remark, on that of *Isai.* 48. 12. *Hearken O Israel, I am HE; I am the First, I am also the Last.* And in like manner, *Isai.* 41. 4. *Isai.* 43. 10, 13, 25. *Deut.* 32. 39. *I, even I, am HE* (Hu) *and there is no other God with me, or beside me.* (And to the same purpose elsewhere.) *Ani Hu*; I am HE; so we render it.

I am HE; What HE? 'Tis ὁ αὐτὸς, κατ' ἐξοχήν, 'Tis the HE Absolutely taken, and *Emphatically applied to God.* Which I take to be of like import with, ὁ Ὤν, I AM; *I that AM,* or *That which IS.* * The Greek Septuagint (in the places cited) renders *Ani Hu* by ἐγώ εἰμι: And the vulgar Latin (indifferently) by *Ego*

* For I take the Hebrew Pronouns *Hu* and *Hi,* (which we commonly render by *He, She,* or *It,* according as the Gender varies) to be Derivatives from the Verb *Havah* or *Hajah* which signifies *To Be.* Not that I take *Hu* to be a proper Name of God (as are *Jah,* and *Jehovah,* from the same Verbs,) But an Appellative word, common to the Creatures also; but here Emphatically applied to God, (as are the words ὁ Ὤν and τὸ Ὄν, which are common to the Creatures also; for they also are, in their kind, ὄντα.) And the Latin Pronouns *is, id,* (that is, *he* or *it*) when *Relatively* taken, are to be expounded of their *Antecedent* to which they Relate: But when put *Absolutely* without an Antecedent; they are of alike import with τὸ *Quid* taken Substantively: (ὁ τὶς, or τὸ τί) according to which we use to say (even in *our* Metaphysicks) *Ens & Aliquid convertuntur,* (*He* or *It,* so taken, are of the same import, with *a Being,* or *What Is.*) And the Learned *Gataker* (than whom I do not know that we have a better Critick; more Judicious or more Acute;) though (in his Book *De Stylo Novi Instrumenti, contra Pfochenium,*) he do not take *Hu* to be a *Proper Name* of God (but communicable to Creatures, however here Emphatically applied to him:) Yet doth allow, that in these places, and in many others (of which he gives divers instances) it is used for the *Verb Substantive* (*Sum,* or *Est.*) Which is the same with what I say, that it Imports a *Being,* or *to Be,* (and therefore, when signally applied to God, his Absolute, Infinite, Independent, *Self-Being.*) And so, it seems, the Septuagints did here understand it, who render *Ani Hu,* by ἐγώ εἰμι, I AM; (and the Vulgar Latin, by *Ego Sum*;) and in the New Testament (which commonly follows the Phrase of the Septuagints) Christ says it of himself, *Before Abraham Was* (not *I Was,* but) *I Am,* (ἐγώ εἰμι,) importing thereby his *Permanent* and *Insuccessive* Being; co-existent to all the varieties of (Successive) Duration; Past, Present, and Future: *the same Yesterday, and To-day, and for ever.* The difference between *is* or *id* Relatively taken (relating to what we call the Antecedent,) and the same taken Absolutely (without such reference to other than it self;) is much the same as between (what the Logicians call) *Est secundi adjecti* (which is but a *Copula* to join the Predicate with the Subject,) and *Est tertii adjecti*; where it self is (or doth include) the Predicate. As when *Socrates Est,* is resolved by *Socrates Est Ens,* or *Est Existens*; The word *Est,* so taken, including both the *Copula* and the *Predicate:* Like as *id* or *quid* Substantively taken, is not *Relative, but Absolute,* and the same with *Ens.*

Sum,

Sum, Ego Ipſe, Ego Sum Ipſe, Ego Ipſe Sum: That is, *I am He*, or *I AM.* And Chriſt, of himſelf, *Joh.* 8. 58. πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθ, ἐγώ εἰμι, *Before Abraham was, I AM.* And I the rather take it ſo to ſignify (in the places cited) becauſe I there find it attended (exegetically) with an Intimation of his *Eternity*; He *Is*, He is the *Firſt* and he is the *Laſt*; Before him *none Was*, and after him *none ſhall Be:* He Is, and ever Was, and ever ſhall Be.

CHARACTER III.

The next Character that I ſhall inſiſt upon, is that of the two *Proper Names* of God, *Jah* and *Jehovah*; which I take to be Proper to God, and Incommunicable to any other. I put them both together, becauſe they be both of the ſame import; and indeed, of the ſame with *Ehjeh*, (I AM) before-mentioned. The chief difference is, that *Ehjeh* (I AM) retains the form of the *Verb*; but *Jah* and *Jehovah* are *Nouns* verbal, from *Hajah* or *Havah* which ſignifie *to Be:* All denoting Gods abſolute *Being:* And All peculiar to the Supreme God, and no where applied in Scripture (that I know of) to any other. I know the *Socinians* would perſwade us that *Jehovah* is ſometime given to an *Angel*, which we do not deny; but we ſay *that Angel* is not a *Created* Angel, but the *Angel of the Covenant*, who is God himſelf.

The name *Jah* comes often in the Old Teſtament, but not ſo often as *Jehovah.* Particularly in *Pſal.* 68. 5. *Sing unto God, ſing praiſes to his Name, extol him that rideth upon the heavens by his Name J AH.* So we find it in our Bibles, and it agrees with the Original. But in our Pſalters, (by a continued miſtake,) inſtead of *Jah* or *Ya*, is printed *Yea* *.

* In one Great Bible of this Tranſlation, (amongſt Mr. *Selden*'s Books in the *Bodleyan* Library) *appointed to be read in Churches* (as we are told in the Title page) printed (if I do not miſ-remember the date) about the Reign of King *Edward* the Sixth, or the end of King *Henry* the Eighth, I find the *Name* J A. But in all other (whether Pſalters or Bibles, Old or New) of that Tranſlation (that I have con-

But

ſulted) it is *Yea*. Of which (I ſuppoſe) the occaſion at firſt was this: The Hebrew Letter, by different perſons, is differently called *Jod* and *Yod*; and accordingly that Name to be written in Engliſh *Ja* or *Ya*. Which being (it ſeems) in ſome Books written or printed *Ya*; ſome after-Printer thinking it to be miſ-printed for *yea*, did ſo (as he thought) Correct it; and the Error hath thence been propagated ever ſince. Yet this having (it ſeems) been diſcovered by ſome-body, ſome while ſince; I find in divers late Editions of the Pſalter, or Pſalms in our Book of Common-prayer, (which follows that Tranſlation) it is thus printed *praiſe him in his name, yea, and rejoyce before him,* (with a *Comma* before and after *yea,*) leaving it indifferent, whether to refer *Yea* (or *Ya*) to the former Clauſe, as the Name of God; or, to the latter Clauſe as the Affirmative particle *yea*. But in the Original Hebrew, and in all other Tranſlations (that I have obſerved) in any Language, I find the name *Jah*, or ſomewhat equivalent thereunto; as doubtleſs it ought to be.

But this name is no where (I think) retained in the Greek Septuagint, (the Septuagint renders it by Κύριος ὄνομα αὐτῷ:) Nor in the New Teſtament (which frequently follows the Septuagints form of Speech,) unleſs in the Solemn Form of praiſe *Hallelu-Jah* (which the Greek puts into one word *Alleluia*) that is, *Praiſe Jah*, or (as it is uſually rendred) *Praiſe ye the Lord*. Which is jointly applied to *him that ſits upon the Throne* and to *the Lamb*, Rev. 19. 1, 3, 4, 6. whom I take to be there meant by *the Lord our God*, ver. 1. and *the Lord God Omnipotent*, ver. 6. and *the Great God*, ver. 17. For *the Supper* of the *Great God*, ver. 17. is the ſame with *the Supper of the Lamb*, ver. 7, 9.

The name *Jehovah* is, in the Old Teſtament, much more frequent; eſpecially in the Original Hebrew. But in our Tranſlation is frequently rendered by *the LORD*; as in all thoſe places (if the Printers have been careful) where LORD is printed in Capital Letters.

The name *Jehovah*, is at *Exod.* 3. 14, 15. made equivalent to *Ehjeh*, I AM. For what is ſaid at *ver.* 14. *Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of Iſrael, I AM hath ſent me unto you*; is thus repeated at *ver.* 15. *Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of Iſrael, JEHOVAH (the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob) hath ſent me unto you:* with this Addition, *This is my name for ever, and this is my me-*

morial unto all generations. And *Pſal.* 83. 18. *That men may know, that thou,* whoſe Name alone is JEHOVAH, *art the moſt High over all the earth.*

In which place, the reſtrictive word *Alone*, cannot be underſtood to affect the word *Name*, as if it were thus to be conſtrued, (*cujus nomen eſt Jehovah ſolum,*) *Whoſe name is Only Jehovah*; (For God we know had other Names, whereby he is often called:) But to the word *Whoſe*, (*cujus ſolius nomen eſt Jehovah,*) *To whom Alone* (*or to whom Only*) *the name Jehovah doth belong.* So *Iſai.* 45. 5. *I am JEHOVAH and none elſe; there is no God beſide me.* And *Deut.* 5. 35, 39. *JEHOVAH he is God, and there is none elſe beſide him: JEHOVAH he is God in heaven above, and upon earth beneath, there is none elſe.* And *Iſai.* 42. 8. *I am JEHOVAH that is my name; and my Glory will I not give unto another.* And *Deut.* 6. 4. *Hear, O Iſrael, the* LORD *thy God is one* LORD; or, *JEHOVAH thy God is one JEHOVAH;* there is no other *Jehovah* but he. And *Deut.* 28. 58. *That thou mayeſt fear this glorious and fearful name,* THE LORD THY GOD, or *JEHOVAH thy God.* And to the ſame purpoſe, *Deut.* 32. 39. 1 *Sam.* 12. 2. and in many other places.

I will not diſpute, whether this name *JEHOVAH*, were never made known, till God did thus declare it to *Moſes*, at Exod. 3. 15. It might ſeem ſo to be by that of *Exod.* 6. 3. *I appeared unto Abraham, and to Iſaac, and to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH, was I not known to them.* 'Tis true, that God is often *ſo* called in the Book of *Geneſis:* But that Book was written by *Moſes*, after the time that *Moſes* ſpeaks of, in *Exodus.* And *Moſes* might ſo call him, by a name known at the time *when* he wrote, though it had not been known at the time *whereof* he wrote.

wrote. As when *Abraham* is ſaid to go forth from *Ur of the Chaldees*, or of *Chaſdim*, Gen. 11. 31. though *Cheſed* the Son of *Nahor* (from whom, in likelihood, the *Chaldees* were called *Chaſdim*) was not born till afterwards, as appears *Gen.* 22. 22. So *Exod.* 12. 40. where the *Children of Iſrael* are ſaid to have *ſojourned four hundred and thirty years*; it muſt be reckoned backward as far as *Abraham*'s coming forth *from Ur of the Chaldees*, at which time they could not be called, *the Children of Iſrael*, (for *Iſrael* was not then born,) but it was *that people*, who were *afterwards* called *the Children of Iſrael*. And many ſuch *Prolepſes*, or anticipations of Names, there are in all Hiſtorians.

But, whether it be upon this account, or ſome other, that he is ſaid, *by his Name JEHOVAH not to have been known to them*, is not material to our preſent buſineſs. 'Tis enough, that *Jehovah* is now known to be the ſignal Name of the *True God*; and (I think) no where given to any other.

Now that our Saviour Chriſt is called *Jehovah*, is not to be denied. And it is for this reaſon, that the *Socinians* would have us think that this *Name* is not *peculiar* to God. In *Jer.* 23. 5, 6. he is called *Jehovah Tzidkenu*, the *LORD our Righteouſneſs*. *Behold the days come ſaith the Lord, that I will raiſe unto David a Righteous Branch; and a King ſhall reign and proſper, and ſhall execute judgment and juſtice on the Earth; In his days Judah ſhall be ſaved, and Iſrael ſhall dwell in ſafety:* (which is agreed, by Jews and Chriſtians, to be underſtood of the *Meſſias*.) *And this is the name whereby he ſhall be called* (JEHOVAH Tzidkenu) *the LORD our Righteouſneſs*, (*JEHOVAH our Righteouſneſs*.) And to the ſame purpoſe, *Jer.* 33. 15, 16.

In *Pſal.* 102. which is called, *A prayer of the afflicted, when he poureth out his complaint before the LORD* (Jehovah)

hovah.) It begins thus, *Hear my prayer O LORD* (Jehovah) *and let my cry come unto thee.* And he to whom this prayer is made, is eight or nine times called *the LORD* (Jehovah.) Now he to whom this prayer is made (we are told, *Hebr.* 1. 8, 10, 11, 12.) is our Lord Christ; *Unto the Son he saith,---Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands; They shall perish, but thou remainest; They all shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* All which is cited out of that Prayer, made to the Lord *Jehovah.*

So *I the LORD* (Jehovah) *the first and the last,* Isai. 41. 4. *Thus saith the LORD* (Jehovah) *before me there was no God, neither shall there be after me,* Isai. 43. 10. *Thus saith the LORD* (Jehovah,) *the King of Israel, and his Redeemer,* (Jehovah) *the LORD of Hosts, I am the first and I am the last; and beside Me there is no God,* Isai. 44. 6. which are the Characters applied to Christ, *Rev.* 1. 8, 9. & 2. 8. & 21. 6. & 22. 13. as was shewed before.

'Tis true, that in the Greek Septuagint of the Old Testament, the name *Jehovah* is no where retained; but ὁ κύριος (I think) every where put for it. Whether because of a Jewish Superstition, no where to pronounce that Name; or because it could not conveniently be expressed in Greek Letters; I will not determine. And for that reason (because the Septuagints did not use it) it is not used in the New Testament (which doth mostly comply with the Language of the Septuagints; as being the Greek Translation then in use.) And therefore we are not to look for the Name *Jehovah* there applied to Christ. But divers places are in the New Testament applied to Christ, wherein the name *Jehovah* was used in the Old Testament. And the name ὁ κύριος (*the Lord*) by which both.

both the Septuagints and the New Testament do constantly render the Hebrew Name *Jehovah*, is so frequently applied to Christ in the New Testament, as that (throughout the New Testament) it is almost his constant Character, the *Lord*, the *Lord Jesus Christ*, &c. *One Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory*, Jam. 2. 1. *My Lord and my God*, Joh. 20. 28. *No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost*, 1 Cor. 12. 3. And elsewhere so often, that none can be ignorant of it.

CHARACTER IV.

The last Character (which I shall insist upon) of the *True* God, the *Only* God; is that of the *Lord God of Israel*; *Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. Deut. 6. 4. And *the Lord thy God*, is almost the constant Language of *Moses* to the Children of *Israel:* And it is the Character which God directs him to use; *Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all Generations*, Exod. 3. 15. and *the Lord God of the Hebrews*, ver. 18. And elsewhere very often throughout the Bible. And doubtless, he that was the Lord God of *Israel*, is the true God, the only God. 'Tis *He* who tells us, *I am the Lord thy God--- Thou shalt have no other God but Me*, Exod. 20. 3. And, *Besides Me, there is no other God*, Isai. 44. 6. and so often elsewhere, that it is needless to name the places.

And this Character, as well as the rest, is expressly given to Christ also, *Luk.* 1. 16, 17. where we are expressly told of *John the Baptist*, that *many of the Children of Israel shall he turn to* the Lord Their God (to the Lord God of *Israel:*) *for he shall go before Him in the spirit and*

power

power of Elias. Now we all know, whoſe *fore-runner John* Baptiſt was; and *before whom* he was to go, *in the Power and Spirit of Elias.* And he before whom he was thus to go, is *the Lord God of Iſrael*; and therefore not only a *Titular* God, or a *Creature* God, but the *True* God, the *Supreme* God, the ſame God with that God who is *the Lord God of Iſrael*; whom no man doubts to be the *True God*, the *Supreme God*, the *Only God.*

I might add many other Characters given to Chriſt, proving him to be the True God; as that *Rev.* 2. 13. *I am he which ſearcheth the Reins and Hearts, and I will give unto every one according to his Works,* (and to the ſame purpoſe, *Rev.* 22. 12. and elſewhere:) which God (the True God) claims as his peculiar Prerogative, *Jer.* 17. 9, 10. *The heart is deceitful above all things, and deſperately wicked, Who can know it? I the LORD ſearch the Heart, I try the Reins; to give to every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.* And to the ſame purpoſe, *Jer.* 11. 20. *Jer.* 20. 12. 1 *Chron.* 28. 9. *Pſal.* 7. 9. *Pſal.* 139. 1. and in many other places. And that likewiſe of *Iſai.* 9. 6. His Name *ſhall be called Wonderful Councellor, the Mighty God, the Everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace,* &c. with many other Characters of like nature, which can never agree to any but the True God.

But it is not my buſineſs, in this ſhort Diſcourſe, to ſay All that might be ſaid; but what may be ſufficient.

He therefore that is (as hath been ſhewed) *God*, the *True God*; the *Mighty God*; the *Everlaſting Father*; the *Eternal God*; the *Firſt and the Laſt*, (*before* whom nothing was, and *after* whom nothing ſhall be) that *Was, and Is, and ſhall Be*; the *ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever*; the *Almighty*; by whom *the World was made*; by whom *all things were made, and without whom nothing was made that was made*; who

who *laid the foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of his hands*; who, *when the Heavens and the Earth ſhall fail, his years endure for ever*; who *ſearcheth the heart and the reins, to give to every one according to his works*; who is *Jehovah*; *the Lord God of Iſrael*; the *Supreme being*; which *is over all, God bleſſed for ever*; who is *the Bleſſed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, to whom be Honour and Power Everlaſting, Amen.* That God (I ſay) of whom all theſe great things are ſaid, is (certainly) not a mere *Titular* God, (who is *called* God but *is not*,) a *Creature* God, or only a dignified *Man*. For, if theſe be not Characters of the *True God*, by what Characters ſhall the *True God* be deſcribed?

I know, the *Socinians* have imployed their Wits to find out ſome tricks to evade or elude ſome of theſe plain places, which I ſhall not trouble my ſelf, or you to repeat; or to give an anſwer to them. For they are ſo weak, and ſo forced, that the plain words of Scripture, read together with the forced ſenſes they would put upon them, are anſwer enough; nor do they need or deſerve any further anſwer.

OBJECTION VIII.

The laſt Objection which I ſhall now take notice of, is this; That the Doctrine of the Trinity was not known to the Jewiſh Church before Chriſt.

To which I anſwer, 1. If it were not made known to them, it was not neceſſary for them to know. For matters of pure Revelation, are not neceſſary to be known, before they are revealed, (nor farther than they are revealed:) But may be ſo to us, to whom they *are* Revealed.

The whole Doctrine of our Redemption by Chriſt, was (doubtleſs) unknown to *Adam* before his Fall; And,

And, had he not fallen, it would have been no fault in him not to have known it at all.

And when (after his fall) it was firſt made known to him, (in that firſt promiſe, that *the Seed of the Woman ſhould break the Serpents head*, Gen. 3. 15.) it was yet ſo dark, that he could know very little (as to the particulars of it) of what is now known to us. And as God by *parcels* (πολυμερῶς) *at ſundry times, and in divers manners*, declared more of it to *Abraham*, to *David*, and the *Prophets*, ſo were they obliged to know and believe more of it: and when *in the laſt days* he had declared the whole of it *by his Son*; Heb. 1. 1, 2. it is now neceſſary for us to believe much more; of which they might be ſafely ignorant. And, of the Trinity likewiſe, if it were not then revealed.

2. But Secondly, There were many things, which though not fully revealed, ſo as to be clearly underſtood by All; were yet ſo inſinuated, as to be in good meaſure underſtood by ſome; and would more be ſo, when *the Veil ſhould be taken off from Moſes's face*, 2 Cor. 3. 13, 15, 16.

Thus the *Death* and *Reſurrection* of Chriſt, were not underſtood, even by his own *Diſciples*, till after his Reſurrection. Yet we muſt not ſay that theſe things were not before intimated in the Scriptures (though covertly;) for when *their underſtandings were opened, to underſtand the Scriptures*, and what had been *written of him in the Law of Moſes, and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms*; they then perceived that *it was ſo written*, and that *it behooved Chriſt to Suffer and to Riſe from the dead the Third day*. Yet this was therein ſo covertly contained, that they ſeem no more to have underſtood it, than that of the *Trinity*.

And St. *Paul* in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, declares a great deal to have been covered under *the Jewiſh Rites and*

and Ceremonies; which, certainly, moſt of the Jewiſh Church did not underſtand; though, in good meaſure, it might be underſtood by ſome.

I might ſay the like of the *Reſurrection*; which was but darkly diſcovered till *Immortality was brought to light through the Goſpel*, 2 Tim. 1. 10. We muſt not yet ſay, it was wholly *unknown* to the *Jewiſh* Church, (of whom many, no doubt, did believe it:) Yet neither can we ſay, it was generally received; For we know the *Phariſees* and the *Sadduces* were divided upon that point, *Act.* 23. 6, 7, 8. And ſo little is ſaid of it in the Old Teſtament, that thoſe who had a mind to be captious, might have found much more ſpecious pretence of cavilling againſt it *then*, than our Adverſaries *now* have againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity.

3. I ſay Thirdly, as of the *Reſurrection*, there were then divers intimations, which are now better underſtood (in a clearer light) than at that time they were: So I think there were alſo of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. I ſhall inſtance in ſome of them.

1. That there was, in the Unity of the God-head, a *Plurality* of Somewhat (which now we call Perſons) ſeems fairly to be inſinuated, even in that of *Elohim-bara*, Gen. 1. 1. *(In the beginning God created,)* where *Elohim* (God) a Nominative Caſe Plural, is joined with *Bara*, a Verb Singular; (which is as if we ſhould ſay in Engliſh, *We Am*, or *They Doth*; which would to us ſound odly, if ſomewhat of Myſtery be not intended in it.) Nor is it here only, but very frequently, that God is called *Elohim* in the Plural Number, (and much oftner than in the Singular Number *Eloah*,) as if, though *Jehovah* be but *One*, yet *Elohim* may be *Three*: Not Three *Gods*, but Three *Somewhats* in that One God. (For though it be *Elohim*, yet it is *Bara*: It is *So* Three, as yet to be *One*.) Nor is it *Elohajim* (in the Dual Number) as ſpoken of

Two, or a *Couple*; but *Elohim* (in the Plural Number) as of *more than Two*.

This may perhaps be called a *Criticism*, (and it is so.) But I am loth to say, it is purely *Casual*, and not designed. For many times little Circumstances, and unheeded Expressions (as at first they may seem to be,) may (by the Divine Wisdom) be fore-designed to some considerable purpose. As, that of, *Not a bone of it shall be broken*, *Exod.* 12. 46. *Numb.* 9. 12. *Psal.* 34. 20. And that of, *they pierced my hands and my feet*, Psal. 22. 16. And, *they shall look upon him whom they have pierced*, Zach. 12. 10. And that, *they part my garment among them, and on my vesture they cast lots*, Psal. 22. 18. And, *they gave me gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink*, Psal. 69. 21. Which are most of them, but Poetical Expressions; and seemingly casual, and undesigned, as to their Literal Sense; but were providentially ordered, as being literally to be fulfilled; as we find in *Joh.* 19. 23, 24, 28, 29, 36, 37. and in the places parallel of the other Gospels.

I might instance in a great many such, which at first might seem Casual, but were Providentially designed. I shall content my self at present with one more; which is that of St. *Paul*, (which perhaps may be thought to look as like a *Criticism* as what I mention) *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed which is Christ.* Now the *promises* made to *Abraham*, to which he refers, are those *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. (which, I think, is the only place, where, in promises made to *Abraham*, such mention is made of *his Seed.*) *By my self have I sworn, saith the Lord; For because, thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thy Seed, as the stars of the heaven, and*

and as the ſand which is upon the ſea-ſhoar, and thy Seed ſhall poſſeſs the gate of his enemies; and in thy Seed ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſſed; becauſe thou haſt obeyed my voice.

By *Abraham's Seed*, here, is manifeſtly meant *his Children* whom God promiſeth to *multiply*. And it might ſeem to be very indifferent whether to ſay, *thy Seed*, or *thy Children*. But St. *Paul* was ſo nice a *Critick*, as to take advantage of his ſaying *Seed* (in the Singular Number) and not *Seeds* or *Children* (in the Plural) as thereby ſignally denoting (as principally intended) that *One Seed*, which is *Chriſt*. Yet are not the *reſt* of the *Seed* to be quite excluded (even in that laſt Clauſe of it, *In thy Seed ſhall all the Nations of the earth be bleſſed,*) as appears by *Act.* 3. 25. *And ye (men of Iſrael*, ver. 12.) *are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers, ſaying unto Abraham, And in thy Seed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth be bleſſed.* Whence 'tis evident, that ſeemingly unheeded Criticiſms are ſometimes Providentially deſigned. And ſuch I take this of *Bara Elohim*, to be. And it is taken notice of to this purpoſe, both by *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* writers.

The like *Plurality* ſeems plainly intimated in the ſame Chapter, *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let VS make man in OVR image and after OVR likeneſs.* Yet even this *Plurality* is no other than what in another conſideration, is an *Unity*; for ſo it follows, *ver.* 27. *So God created man in HIS own image.* Theſe *Plural Somewhats*, therefore, are but *One God.*

And 'tis but a childiſh excuſe to ſay, It is the *Stile of Princes* to ſpeak in the Plural, *We* and *Us* inſtead of *I* and *Me*. 'Tis indeed a piece of Courtſhip at this day, (and perhaps hath been for ſome Ages:) But how long hath it been ſo? 'Tis not ſo old as *Moſes*; much leſs ſo old as the *Creation*. King *Pharoah*, and *Senacharib*, and

Ahaſuerus, were wont to ſay *I*, *Me*, *Mine*, (not *We*, *Us*, *Ours*.) And *Nebuchadnezzar*, even in the *Height* of his *Pride*, Dan. 4. 30. *Is not this great Babylon that I have built, by the might of MY Power, and for the honour of MY Majeſty.* Here's nothing of *We* and *Our*. This was not *Stilus Regius* in thoſe days. And if we ſhould here expound it by ſuch an equivalence; *And God ſaid, Let Me make man in My image*; it would ſcarce ſound like good Senſe. (For 'tis not uſual to ſpeak *Imperatively* in the *Firſt perſon Singular*.) It ſeems therefore to imply a *Plurality*, though not a Plurality of *Gods*.

The like we have *Gen.* 3. 22. *Behold, the man is become like One of Us.* Is this alſo *Stilo Regio*, inſtead of, *The man is become like one of Me?*

So, *Gen.* 11. 6, 7. *And the* LORD (Jehovah) *ſaid, Let US go down, and confound their Language.*

2. And as theſe places intimate a *Plurality*, ſo I know not but that of *Gen.* 18. may intimate this *Plurality* to be a *Trinity*. That the appearance there of *three Men* to *Abraham*, was a *Divine Apparition* (though *Abraham* did not at firſt apprehend it ſo to be) is evident. For it is expreſly ſaid by *Moſes*, ver 1. *The* LORD (Jehovah) *appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre; and he lift up his eyes, and lo Three Men ſtood by him.* So that this appearance of *Three Men*, was an appearance of the Lord *Jehovah*. And though we do not find that *Abraham* doth any where uſe the word *Jehovah* in that diſcourſe, (but *Adonai* all along:) Yet *Moſes* the Relater (where himſelf ſpeaks) ſays every where *Jehovah*; though when he recites *Abraham*'s words, it is *Adonai*: But even *Adonai* is a word Plural (as well as *Elohim*) that is, *my Lords*; (the Singular is *Adoni*, *my Lord*; but ſeldom ſaid of God.)

Whether it were, that the name *JEHOVAH* were not then *known* to *Abraham* (according to that of *Exod.*

*Exod.*6.3.) or that *Abraham* was not at first aware who it was with whom he was then discoursing; or for what other reason he did avoid using the name *Jehovah*; I shall not trouble my self curiously to enquire: But sure we are that *Moses* tells us, This Apparition of *Three Men* (as at first they seemed to be) was an Apparition of the Lord *Jehovah*.

We need not doubt therefore, but that *God* appeared there, in this Apparition of *Three Men*; which is therefore a fair intimation of a *Trinity of Persons*.

It might perhaps be cavill'd at, if this were all: And so might that of *Jonah*'s being *three days and three nights in the Whale's belly*, when brought as an Argument to prove our Saviour ought *so long* to lie in the Grave. But St. *Paul* tells us, 1 *Cor.* 15. 3, 4. that Christ died for our sins *according to the Scriptures*; and that he rose again the *Third day, according to the Scriptures*. (And Christ in like manner, *Luk.* 24. 46.) Yet I know not any thing more clear to that purpose *in the Scriptures* (of the Old Testament) than either this of *Jonah*'s being so long in the *Whale's belly* (to which Christ himself alludes, *Mat.* 12. 40.) or that of *Hos.* 6. 2. *After two days he will revive us, and the third day he will raise us up.* Which seems not to be more expres (for the Resurrection of Christ on the *Third day*) than this of *Jonah*. But such covert Intimations there are in the Old Testament; of things afterward more clearly discovered in the New.

Nor was this unknown to the ancient Jewish Doctors; as appears by what *Ainsworth* (in his Notes on *Gen.*1.) cites from thence, (out of *R. Simeon, Ben Jochai* in *Zoar*;) *Come see the Mystery of the word* Elohim: *there are three Degrees, and every Degree by it self Distinct; and yet notwithstanding they are all one, and joined together in One, and are not divided one from another*, (only, there he calls *Degrees* what we now call *Persons*.) So that it was not

not unknown to the Jews of old, whatever the present Jews think of it.

3. What these *Three* are, (the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Spirit*,) seems to be likewise intimated in the Story of the Creation, *Gen.* 1. where they seem to be distinctly named.

In the beginning (Elohim) *God created the Heaven and the Earth*, ver. 1. where no man doubts but God the *Father* is implied, though perhaps not He only.

And *ver.* 2. *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters.* Where *Ainsworth* tells us from the ancient *Rabbines* whom he cites, they call him, *The Spirit of Mercies from before the Lord: The Spirit of Wisdom, called, the Spirit of the Living God:* And, *The Spirit of the Messias.* Of the same *Spirit*, we have elsewhere mention; *My Spirit shall not always strive with Man*, Gen. 6. 3. *Take not thine Holy Spirit from me*, Psal. 51. 11. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me*, Isai. 61. 1. *They vexed his Holy Spirit*, Isai. 63. 10. and elsewhere. And if it be said, that by *the Spirit of God*, is meant *God himself:* we say so too, for we do acknowledge, that the *Holy Ghost*, is *God himself.*

And, of *the Word*, there is a like intimation, *ver.* 3. *God* Said (or spake the *Word*) *Let there be Light, and there was Light.* And in like manner, *ver.* 6, 9, 11. 14, 20. *God* Said, *Let there be a Firmament*, &c. So *Psal.* 33. 6, 7. *By the* Word *of the Lord were the Heavens made*, &c. *He Spake and it was done; He Commanded and it stood fast.* And *Psal.* 148. 5. *He Spake the Word and they were made, He commanded and they were created.* Consonant to that of *Heb.* 11. 3. *By faith we understand that the Worlds were made by the* Word *of God.* And 1 *Pet.* 3. 5, 7. *By the* Word *of God the Heavens were of old, and the Earth*, &c. *And by the same* Word *they are kept in store, or preserved.* In which places, by *the Word*, so often mentioned,

tioned, and with such Emphasis put upon it; seems to be meant, that *Word* mentioned, *Joh.* 1. 1, 3, 10. *In the beginning was the Word,* (ὁ λόγος,) *All things were made by Him: The World was made by Him*; just as in *Heb.* 11. 3. *the Worlds were made by the Word of God.*

Nor was this notion of *the Word* (Personally taken) unknown to the Jewish Doctors. For what we have *Psal.* 110. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord,* (*Dixit Jehova Domino meo*) the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, renders by *Dixit Jehova,* (Bemeimreh) *in Verbo suo* meaning, by *His Word,* the *Messias*; and of whom our Saviour himself expounds it, *Mat.* 22. 44. And it is frequent, in that Paraphrase, by *the Word* to design the *Messias*; * as S. *Joh.* doth, *Joh.* 1. 1. *In the beginning was the Word.*

* So in *Isa.* 41. 10. *Fear not, I am with thee*; and *ver.* 13. *Fear not, I will help thee*; and *ver.* 14. *Fear not, I will help thee, saith the Lord and thy Redeemer*; and *ver.* 16. *The Wind* (or Spirit, *Ruach*) *shall carry them away, and the Whirl-wind shall scatter them:* Is in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase (rendred into Latin) *Ne timeas, quia in adjutorium tuum erit Verbum meum. Ne timeas, quia Verbum meum erit in adjutorium tuum. Ne timeatis, ——Verbum meum est in auxilium vestrum, dicit dominus & Redemptor vester. Ventus* (seu Spiritus) *abripiet eos, & Verbum ejus disperget eos, quasi Turbo stipulas.* (Where we have *God*, his *Word*, and *Spirit.*) So in *Isai.* 48. 11. *For my own sake, for my own sake will I do it:* and *ver.* 12. *Hearken unto Me:* and *ver.* 13. *My hand hath laid the foundation of the Earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens:* and *ver.* 15. *I, even I have spoken, I have called him:* and *ver.* 16. *Come ye near unto me, hear ye this:* Are in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, *Propter Nomen meum, propter Verbum meum faciam. Obedite Verbo meo. In Verbo meo fundavi terram, & in Potentia mea appendi cœlos.* (Where again we have *God*, his *Word*, and *Power*, or *Spirit.*) *In Verbo meo pepigi pactum cum Abraham patre vestro, & vocavi eum. Accedite ad Verbum meum, audite hæc.* And, at the like rate, in many other places.

And I put the more weight upon this, because (as here, *Gen.* 1. 2, 3. so) we have in several other places, the *Word* and *Spirit* mentioned as concerned in the Creation, *Psal.* 33. 6. *By the Word of the* LORD (Jehovah) *were the Heavens made, and all the Hosts of them by the* (*Spirit*, or) *breath of his mouth,* (*Beruach.*) Where we have *Jehovah*, his *Word*, and *Spirit.* Job 26. 12, 13. *He divideth the Sea by his Power, and by his* (Wisdom, or) *Understanding he smiteth through the proud*; *By his Spirit he garnisheth the Heavens, his Hand hath formed the crooked Serpent.*

Where

Where we have the *Power* of God, the *Wisdom* of God, and the *Spirit* of God. And *Job* 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Lord hath given me Life.* So, *Psal.* 104. 24, 30. *O LORD* (Jehovah) *how wonderful are thy Works, in* Wisdom *thou hast made them all. Thou sendest forth thy* Spirit, *they are created, and thou renewest the face of the Earth.*

And it is not amiss here to take notice, that as λόγος signifies as well *ratio* as *oratio*; so Christ (ὁ λόγος) is called the *Word* of God, and the *Wisdom* of God. And as in *Joh.* 1. 1, 3, 10. it is said of *the Word*, that *in the beginning was the Word, all things were made by Him, and the World was made by him:* And *Heb.* 11. 3. *The Worlds were framed by the Word of God.* So the same is said of *Wisdom*, Prov. 3. 19. *The LORD by* Wisdom *hath formed the Earth, by Understanding hath he established the Heavens.* And *Prov.* 8. 22. &c. *The LORD possessed me* (Wisdom) *in the beginning of his way, before his works of old; I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, ere ever the Earth was;*----*When he prepared the Heavens I was there,*---- *When he established the Clouds above,*---- *When he strengthened the Fountains of the deep,*--- *When he appointed the Foundations of the Earth, then was I by him*, &c.

And accordingly the *Holy Ghost* is called the *Power* of God, *Luk.* 1. 35. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee.* And 1 *Pet.* 1. 5. *Who are kept by the Power of God, through Faith unto Salvation*; which doubtless is not without the operation of the *Holy Ghost*, working and preserving faith in us.

Suitably hereunto, God's Power and Wisdom are oft conjoyned. *He is Wise in Heart, and Mighty in Strength*, Job 9. 4, &c. *He is excellent in Power, and in Judgment*, Job 37. 13.

But, (without laying too great a stress on every particular,) there seems a foundation clear enough to consider the *Word* of God, and the *Spirit* of God, as clearly distin-

distinguishable, even in the great Work of Creation; and that the holy Writers, even in the Old Testament, have considered them as distinct; and that even the Jewish Writers have owned them as such.

I know very well that those who have a mind to be captious, may cavil at these places, as the *Sadduces* of old did at those passages in the Old Testament tending to prove a *Resurrection*.

And not those only, but even some of our own; who would have us think, that the Fathers before Christ had only *Promises* of *Temporal* blessings (not of *Heavenly* and *Eternal*:) Though St. *Paul* tells us, (when, *of the hope and resurrection of the dead he was called in question;*) that he did *so worship the God of his Fathers, believing all things which were written in the Law and the Prophets, and had hope towards God (which they also allowed) that there should be a Resurrection of the dead both of the Just and Unjust*; and that it was *a promise made of God to their Fathers, to which their twelve Tribes instantly serving God day and night, hoped to come*; which were *no other things than what Moses and the Prophets had said should come to pass*; and which to *King Agrippa* (who if not a *Jew*, was at least well acquainted with their Doctrines) should not *seem strange*, *Act.* 23.6. *Act.* 24.14, 15. *Act.* 26.2,3,6,7,8,22. And *Heb.* 11.13. that *all these died in faith, not having received the promises*; (that is, they died in the belief of better things than what they had yet received:) *But saw them afar off, and were perswaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed, they were but strangers and Pilgrims upon Earth.* And our Saviour proves it out of the Old Testament, (*Mat.* 22.32.) by such an Argument, as if one of us should have urged, it would perhaps have been ridiculed: *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*; *Now God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* And the Apostle pursues the same Argument, *Heb.* 11.9, 10, 14, 15, 16.

They ſojourned in the Land of promiſe, as in a ſtrange Land, dwelling in Tabernacles (movable from place to place) *for they looked for a City which hath foundations* (a fixed City, not flitting as were thoſe Tabernacles,) *whoſe builder and maker is God: Declaring plainly that they did ſeek a Country: Not ſuch as that from whence they came; but a better Country, that is, a Heavenly: wherefore God is not aſhamed to be called* their God; *for he hath prepared for them a City*; where he directly argues, that God's Promiſe, *to be their God*, was a Promiſe of *Heaven*.

And no doubt but the Prophets, and Men of God, had taught them all along, to put a *Spiritual* Senſe, upon thoſe (ſeemingly) *Temporal Promiſes*, (though the *Sadduces* would not believe it, but cavilled at it;) in ſo much that not only the *Phariſees* and *Doctors of the Law*; but even the *Women* embraced it (even *before* Chriſt's Reſurrection;) *I know ſaith Martha* (of her dead Brother *Lazarus*) *that he ſhall Riſe again in the Reſurrection, at the laſt day*, Joh. 11. 24. And, of ſuch *Spiritual Senſes*, we have copious Inſtances, in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and elſewhere frequently.

And as they did without any reluctances, readily embrace the Doctrine of the *Reſurrection*, when more clearly declared by the Apoſtles, (as a thing not wholly *new* to them;) ſo neither do we find in them any Reluctance to that of the *Trinity* (for which, in likelihood, they had in like manner been *before* prepared:) but readily cloſed with the Form of Baptiſm, *in the Name* (not *Names*) *of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, Mat. 28. 19. And that Solemn *Benediction*, 2 Cor. 13. 14. *The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all, Amen*. Where we have all the Three Perſons reckoned together; as they are alſo in that celebrated place, 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; theſe Three are One*. And as they had been before

before by Christ himself, *Joh.* 14. 26. *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things.* And *Joh.* 15. 26. *The Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which Proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me.* And (to name no more places) *Mat.* 3. 16, 17. *Jesus, when he was baptized, went straitway out of the Water: And lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he (John* the Baptist) *saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and lighting upon Him: And lo, a voice from heaven saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

4. There is yet another Consideration which doth confirm this opinion, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* was not unknown to the *Jewish Church* before Christ: From the footsteps thereof yet extant in Heathen Writers.

'Tis well known (to those conversant in such Studies) that much of the Heathen Learning (their Philosophy, Theology, and Mythology) was borrowed from the Jews; though much Disguised, and sometimes Ridiculed by them. Which things though they be Fabulous, as disguised in a Romantick dress: yet they are good Evidence that there was a *Truth in History*, which gave occasion to those *Fables*.

None doubts but *Ovid*'s Fable of the *Chaos* (of which all things were made) took its rise from *Moses*'s History of the *Creation*: And *Deucalion*'s *Flood*, from that of *Noah*: and the *Titan*'s fighting against the Gods, from the Builders of *Babel*'s Tower: And that of Two-faced *Janus*, from *Noah*'s looking backward & forward to the World before and since the Flood. And many the like, of which we may see in *Natalis Comes*, in *Bochartus*, and others: And of which we have a large Collection in *Theophilus Gale*'s *Court of the Gentiles*. And in Dr. *Duport*'s *Gnomologia Homerica*; wherein is a Collection of *Homer*'s *Sayings*,

which look like Allusions to like Passages in Sacred Scripture; and seem to be borrowed (most of them) from those Books of it, which were written before *Homer*'s time; who yet is one of the most Ancient and most Famed of Heathen Writers.

Plato hath borrowed so much of his Philosophy, History, and Theology, from the *Jewish* learning, as that he hath obtained the Title of (Μωσὴς Ἀττικίζων) *Moses disguised in a Greek dress.* And, may seem, because the name of *Jews* was odious, to cite them rather by the names of certain *Barbarians*, *Syrians*, *Phœnicians*, *Egyptians*, &c. From that Title of God in *Exodus*, I AM, ὁ Ὤν, (or from the Equivalent names of *Jah* and *Jehovah*) he borrows his (τὸ ὄν, ὡυτὸ ὄν, ὄντως ὄν,) *the Being*, (or *that which Is*,) *the very Being*, *the true Being*; which are the Titles he gives to the Supreme God. For his *Immortality of the Soul*, he reckons the best Argument to be (θεῖος λόγος) *a Divine Revelation*, which he had by *Tradition* from certain *Ancients*, who lived (as he speaks) *nearer to the Gods*, (as if he had borrowed even this Phrase from *Deut.* 4. 7. *What nation is so great, who hath God so Nigh unto them?*) And much more, as hath been noted by others.

And I am so far from thinking (as the *Socinians* would have us) that St. *John* did but *Platonize*, and borrowed his ὁ λόγος from *Plato*'s Trinity; that I rather think, that *Plato* borrowed his *Trinity* (as he did many other things) from the *Jewish Doctrine*, though by him disguised: And take it for a good Evidence, that the Doctrine of the Trinity, was then not unknown to them.

Aristotle, in the last Chapter of his Book, *De Mundo*; which is *de Dei Nominibus*: He tells us that *God, though he be but One, hath many Names*: And amongst those *many*, he reckons that of the *Tres Parcæ* (τρεῖς αἱ Μοῖραι) or as we call them, *the Three Destinies* (*Atropas*, *Clotho*, and *Lachesis*; (whom he doth accommodate to the three diversities

verſities of *Time*; *paſt*, *preſent*, *and future*,) to be *One* of theſe Names. Which, though numbred as *Three*, are but this *One God*. Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐστὶν οὐκ ἄλλό τι πλὴν ὁ Θεός. (And cites *Plato* to the ſame purpoſe) καθάπερ καὶ ὁ γενναῖος Πλάτων φησίν. So that it ſeems both *Plato* and *Ariſtotle* were of opinion, that *Three Somewhats* may be *One God*. And this, in likelihood, they derived from the Jewiſh Learning.

I might ſay the like of their *three Judges* in another World, *Minos*, *Radamanthus* and *Æacus*. which thing though it be Fabulous, yet it implies thus much, That they had *then* a Notion, not only of the *Soul's Immortality*, but alſo of a *Trinity* of *Perſons* in another World, who ſhould take Account of mens Actions in this World. And both theſe Notions they had, no doubt, from the *Jewiſh* Learning; from whence their moſt ſublime Notions were derived.

To theſe I might add that of their three-ſhap'd *Chimæra*; which their Poets feign to have been. Πρόσθε λέων, ὄπισθε δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα, as is to be ſeen in *Homer* one of their moſt Ancient Poets. And that of *Cerberus*, their three-headed Porter of the other World.

Which Poetical Fictions, though invented perhaps to *ridicule* the Trinity; do yet at laſt argue that they had *then* ſome notices of a Trinity, (of *Three Somewhats* which were yet but *One*.) For, if they had no notice of it, they could not have ridiculed it.

Our Adverſaries, perhaps, may pleaſe themſelves with the Fanſy, that *Chimæra* and *Cerberus* are brought in to prove the *Trinity*.

But they miſtake the point: We are not now *Proving* the Trinity, (which is already ſettled on a firmer Foundation;) but inquiring, whether *this* Doctrine were *then* known. And as we think it a good argument to prove the *Chriſtian Religion*, to have been known in *Lucian*'s time, (and known to *him*,) becauſe *Lucian* doth *Scoff* at it; which he could not have done, if he had known nothing of it: So is it a good Argument to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity* to have been *then* known, when it was ridiculed.

And it proves alſo, that there might be *then* prophane Wits to ridicule it, as there are *now* to *Blaſpheme the Trinity*, as a *three-*

headed

headed Monſter; and, that this little Wit of theirs, is not their own, but ſtollen from wittier Heathens.

But, whether it were, or were not, known to the Jewiſh Church before Chriſt, (of which there be great Preſumptions that it was ſo known, as well as that of the *Reſurrection:*) it is enough to us, that we are taught it *now*. And, if any will yet be ſo obſtinate as not to believe, either the *Reſurrection*, or the *Trinity*; upon pretence that neither of them was known to the *Jewiſh Church*, (or at leaſt, not ſo clearly, but that they may be able to cavil at places from the Old Teſtament alledged to prove either;) we muſt leave them to the Wiſdom and Judgment of God, till he ſhall think fit to inſtruct them better.

Now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt; Three Perſons, but One Eternal and Ever bleſſed God; be Praiſe, Honour and Glory, Now and for Evermore, Amen.

FINIS.

Advertiſement.

BY reaſon of the Authors abſence from the Preſs at ſo great a diſtance, ſome miſtakes have happened, both in the Letters and Sermons; and ſome things omitted, which ſhould have been inſerted in their proper places, but that they came ſo late to the Printers hands, that it could not well be done without diſcompoſing his Affairs. Of both which it is thought fit thus to direct.

ERRATA.

LEt. I. *p.* 12. *l.* 6. *for* Diviſions *read* Dimenſions. *p.* 13. *l.* 6. *dele* Three. *p.* 18. *l.* 7. *for* Meaning *read* Memory.

Let. II. *p.* 7. *l.* 21. *for* that *read* ſhall.

Let. III. *p.* 30. *l.* 11. as a ſeparate Exiſtence. *p* 32 *l.* 7. as to be. *p.* 37. *l. ult. for* Thoſe *read* Theſe. *p.* 41. *l.* 18. known. *p.* 57. *l.* 7. *for* ſure *read* ſave.

Let. IV. *p.* 7. *l.* 20. *for* toil *read* talk. *p.* 11. *l.* 2. as well as.

Let. V. *p.* 6. *l.* 22. *dele* of. *p.* 7. *l.* 19. *for* any *read* my. *p.* 11. *l.* 10. *read* 1 Joh. 5. 20. *p.* 12. *l.* 18. *for* Iſrael *read* Jacob. *p.* 18. *l.* 13. doth not well. *p.* 21. *l.* 14. ſaid ſo much.

Let. VI. *p.* 4. *l.* 1. *for* Nor *read* Now. *p.* 9. *l.* 28. *for* then *read* there. *p.* 10. *l.* 28. *for* London *read* Leyden. *p.* 11. *l.* 19. at leaſt. *p.* 13. *l.* 30. *for* This *read* Thus. *p.* 14. *l.* 33. *for* as *read* in. *l.* 34. thee only, the. *p.* 17. *l.* 6. *for* Railing *read* Ranting. *p.* 18. *l.* 2. was not then. *l.* 13. beſide that in.

Let. VII. *p.* 6. *l* 28. Poſſibility. *p.* 7. *l.* 27. *for* fourth *read* fault. *p.* 10. *l. pen.* All-comprehenſive. *p.* 12. *l.* 20. Father. *p.* 13. *l.* 5. *after* Notions, *add* further than they are revealed. *l. pen.* Words. *p.* 14. *l.* 13. Hands. *p.* 17. *l.* 13. to Anſwer. *l.* 23. *for* one *read* me.

Serm. *p.* 15. *l.* 14. exegerical. *p.* 19 *l.* 7. God. *p.* 22. *l.* 19. *for* for *read* or. *l.* 21. *for* er *read* fer. *P.* 61. *l.* 9. *read* Author. *P.* 73. *l.* 3. *read* were framed.

ADDITIONS.

LET. I. *p.* 2. *l.* 1. *after* united, *add* or intimately One. *p.* 12. *l.* 21. *after* Cube, *add*, (there being no limits in nature, greater than which a Cube cannot be).

Let. III. *p.* 16. *l* 18. *Add this Marginal Note*, The Saxon word *Hel* or *Helle*, (whence comes the Engliſh word *Hell*,) doth not properly or neceſſarily import *the place of the Damned*; But may be indifferently taken for *Hell*, *hole*, or *hollow place*: Which are all words of the ſame original. *Helan* (to hide, or cover,) *Hole* (cavitas,) *Hol* (cavus) hollow. And when it is uſed in a reſtrained ſenſe; it is Metonymical, or Synecdochical; as when *Hole* or *Pit*, is put for the *Grave*, and the like. *p.* 19. *l.* 2. *Add*, So that I take the plain ſenſe of the words to be this: *He was* (for ſome time) *in that Hell*, or *Hades* (what ever by that word be meant); *wherein* (it is expreſly ſaid) *he was not left*; but was *Raiſed from it*. *p.* 44. *l.* 16. *Add*, Beſide this Letter of thanks from his Partner in the Diſputation; there was another from *Sandius* himſelf, (not Printed, but in Manuſcript,) acknowledging a like conviction. Of which *Wittichius* recites an Extract, in his *Cauſa Spiritus Sancti Victrix demonſtrata, à Chriſtophoro Wittichio. Lugduni Batavorum, apud Cornelium Bouteſtein*, 1682.

Let. IV. *p.* 36. *l.* 26. *after* Athanaſius, *Add*, ('Tis the ſame thing with me, whether it were written by Him or ſome Other, as long as I find it agreeable to Scripture. *At the end of the ſame line*, *Add* (Wherein yet I would not be thought to encourage dangerous Errors: For the Errors are equally Dangerous, and equally Fundamental; whether I do, or do not Anathematize them.) *p.* 38. *at the End*; *Add* Jan. 13. 169$\frac{6}{7}$. Yours, *John Wallis*.

Let. VI. *p.* 9. *l.* 25. *Add this Marginal Note*. *Socinus*'s Words are theſe: *Velim autem ſcias, me duplici de cauſa (præter eam quam ipſe commemoras) ab iſta quæſtione, De Animæ Immortalitate, abſtinuiſſe. Nam & mihi res erat cum homine qui me calumniandi, inq; omnium invidiam vocandi, omnem occaſionem quærebat. Necdum mihi, quid de quæſtione iſta ſtatuendum ſit, plane exploratum erat; quemadmodum nec hodie quidem eſt. Tantum id mihi videtur ſtatui poſſe; Poſt hanc vitam, animam ſeu animum hominis non ita per ſe ſubſiſtere ut præmia ulla pœnaſve ſentiat, vel etiam iſta ſentiendi ſit capax. Quæ mea Firma Opinio facile poteſt ex Diſputatione iſta colligi: Cum ex multis quæ identidem à me ibi dicuntur; Tum ex ea ipſa, de qua præcipuè agitur, ſententia mea. Nam quamvis, cum ipſo Puccio diſputans, (qui, ut immortalitatem primi hominis ante peccatum probaret, animi ipſius Immortalitatem mihi objiciebat,) oſtendi, non propterea dici poſſe hominem immortalem quia anima ipſius non moriatur: Tamen ſatis apparet me ſentire, non ita vivere, poſt*

hominis

hominis ipsius mortem, animam ejus, ut per se præmiorum pœnarúmve capax existat: Cum in ipso primo homine, totius Immortalitatis rationem uni gratiæ Divinæ tribuo; nec in ipsa Creatione quidquam Immortalis Vitæ agnosco. Socini Epist. 5. ad Volkelium; die 16. Novembris, Anno, 1596.

Let. VI. p. 12. *l.* 3. *Add this Marginal Note*: *Sandius*'s Words are these, (cited by *Wittichius* in his *Causa Spiritus Sancti Victrix*, pag. 4.) *Jam finitis illis quæ ad Librum tuum regerenda duxi (præter ea quæ satis à Socio meo responsum puto,) Oro te ne graveris ulteriùs hoc argumentum prosequi; quò tandem Veritas, si fieri possit, patefiat; & velut scintilla ex silice ad Chalybem allisa prosiliat. Nam ingenuè fateor, mihi conjecturam meam longè verisimiliorem visam, antequam Librum tuum, quo me docere aggressus es, legissem. Non parùm & contulit ad eam debilitandam, consideratio mea,* Joh. 1. 32, 33. & Mat. 4. 11. *Nam postquam in Baptismo Spiritus Sanctus super Christum descendit, & super eum mansit, eumque in desertum duxit, nec ab eo recessit; (cum non verisimile sit Christum tentationem Satanæ sine Spiritus Sancti auxilio superâsse;) finita demum tentatione dicuntur Angeli accessisse & ministrâsse ei. Quod si itaque conjectura mea consistere non possit, ut vix possit, perpendendum erit, an non Spiritus Sanctus possint esse septem Spiritus Principales; vel, multitudo Spirituum longè subtiliorum cæteris Angelorum ordinibus, fortean naturâ ipsâ: Et an per hanc hypothesin salvari possint omnes difficultates contra conjecturam meam hactenus productæ. Novi quendam qui sentit, Spiritum Sanctum quidem esse unam Personam, eamque creatam, sed totum Universum Essentia sua pervadentem. Valdè autem dubito an hæc sententia subsistere queat. Illa de una Persona Spiritus Sancti comprehensis sub eo Angelis tanquam ejus ministris & satellitibus; mihi non admodum arridet. Si autem horum nihil verum comperiatur; tum demum mihi verisimillimum videbitur, Spiritum Sanctum cum Deo Patre ejusque Verbo, unum Deum, unam Substantiam, unum Individuum esse.*